

THE
**Anti-Intellectual
Manifesto**





THE ANTI-INTELLECTUAL MANIFESTO

**“The two largest brain capacities—
measuring 2800cc—were those of a
U.S. Senator and an idiot.”**

Montague, *Globe and Mail*,
1966, p. 20

THE
Anti-Intellectual
Manifesto

By
Peter S. Ruckman, Ph.D.
President, Pensacola Bible Institute

BIBLE BELIEVERS PRESS
P.O. 7135

Pensacola, Florida 32534

Other Materials Available

† † †

By Dr. Peter S. Ruckman:

- Bible Believer's Commentary Series
- Beginning and Advanced Bible-Study Material
- In-Depth Apologetics
- Numerous Pamphlets of Selected Topics
- Variety of Gospel Tracts
- Audio Cassettes
- Video Cassettes

Also Available:

- A.V. 1611 Bibles
- Study Helps
- Concordances
- Biographies
- Evangelistic Material
- Material by Other Authors and Speakers

† † †

For FREE Current Catalogue write:

Bible Baptist Bookstore

P.O. Box 7135, Pensacola, FL 32514

(904) 477-8812

Table of Contents

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Page</i>
Introduction	i
1. The Magic Words.....	1
2. How to Spot a Scholar.....	19
3. The Mindset of the Great Scholars.....	37
4. Who Then are the Real Scholars.....	75
5. The Enemy of the Scholars.....	85
6. A Handful of Biblical Scholars.....	101
7. Christian Tradesmen with Bloody Hands..	113
8. The Intellect of the "Anti-Intellectual"....	131
Anti-Intellectual Manifesto	139
I.Q. Test.....	148

COPYRIGHT © 1991
Peter S. Ruckman

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

The scripture quotations found herein are from the text of the Authorized King James Version of the Bible. Any deviations therefrom are not intentional.

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

INTRODUCTION

The Communists have a "Manifesto" (Marx), the Humanists have a "Manifesto" (Dewey and Kurtz), and the Christians have a "Manifesto" (Schaeffer), so I don't see any reason why the Anti-Intellectuals shouldn't have a Manifesto. I am (in the sight of the worldly intelligensia) an anti-intellectual: that is, I have no confidence in the flesh (Phil. 3:3) whether it be flesh in the 100 IQ range, or in the 200 IQ range. I tend to believe that **"every man at his best state is altogether vanity,"** and that **"the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God."** I did not always think this way. I once was a young intellectual who worshipped at the shrines of Zeno (495-435 B.C.), Gotama Buddha (570-490 A.D.), Charles Darwin (1809-1882), Nietzsche (1844-1900), Sigmund Freud (1856-1939), Feuerbach (1804-1872), Schopenhauer (1788-1860), Kant (1724-1804), Hegel (1770-1831), Albert Einstein (1879-1955), George Bernard Shaw (1856-1950), Voltaire (1694-1778), and the paleontologists (Martin Lister, Nicolaus Steno, Edward Huxley, Karl Von Linne, Robert Plot, et al.). On the fourteenth day of March, 1949, I had an "encounter" (first class) with a risen Saviour after "searching the scriptures" for answers that had not been given to me in the Harvard Five Foot Shelf of Classics, the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, two Liberal Arts curriculums at Kansas State College and the University of Alabama, plus three years of intensive study in Buddhism, Brahmanism, and Theosophy.

Ever since that day I have admired the scholarship of Laurel and Hardy, Abbott and Costello, Bob Newhart, Dave Gardner, The Three Stooges, and the Four Marx Brothers. To this

day (1991) I believe there is more real Biblical truth in "*Murphy's Laws*" and "*The Peter Principle*" than there is in a book called *The Truth About the KJV Controversy* (Stewart Custer, Bob Jones University Press, 1981). I have come to the conclusion, after seventy years on this earth, that "the bigger the belfry, the more room for the bats," and "if you ain't got no edjication, you jes gotta use yo brains."

I wrote this Manifesto to let the intellects in Europe and America know that some of us common, stupid Southern "red necks" have just as low an opinion of the *National Geographic* magazine, *The Journal of Biblical Literature*, the NEA, the *National Association for the Advancement of Science*, the *Scientific American*, the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, the *Journal of Physical Research*, the *American Civil Liberties Union*, and the *United Bible Society* as they do us, although we have researched their authorities for decades and most of them don't even know the names of ours. This Manifesto is constructed on the idea that the world's greatest brains were either in the heads of unregenerate sinners who died and went to Hell like a bullet, or in the heads of backslidden Christians who were out of the will of God their entire lifetime; ninety-five percent of them not accomplishing one scriptural thing in the heart (or life) of any Christian in their day. The Anti-Intellectual Manifesto states that "scholarship" (secular or sacred, Catholic or Protestant, Fundamental or Liberal, Deistic or Atheistic) is nearly always for one purpose only: to promote *trades* (\$\$\$) where tradesmen can make a living (\$\$\$) by magnifying *the trade* (Acts 19:22-28).

Our thesis is that every major "recognized" scholar (saved or lost) from Lao Tze to Hawking was a "short-sighted fool" with bloody hands, who followed Christ "afar off," and disobeyed all of the scriptural injunctions found in 1 Corinthians 4:16, 11:1; Philippians 3:17; 2 Timothy 2:2; 1 Corinthians 4:1-2; 1 Corinthians 3:18; Acts 24:14; Colossians 1:1-4; Matthew 4:19; and Acts 20:21, 27.

CHAPTER ONE

The Magic Words

When Paul faced his countrymen, after “many years” (Acts 24:17), he tried to reason with them, not just to keep from getting killed (Acts 22:22), but to try and win them to faith in their own Messiah (Acts 22:10-14). This was the main burden of his heart until very late in his life (Rom 9:3). In his defense, Paul appealed to his Jewish ancestry (Acts 22:3, Phil. 3:4-6) and his fidelity to the Mosaic laws and customs (Acts 22:1-10, Acts 18:18). His “ace in the hole” was his support and approval of those who stoned Stephen for blasphemy (Acts 22:20). This incident should have convinced any traditional Jew who swore by “Moses” (Acts 6:11) that Paul was a “**Hebrew of the Hebrews**” (Phil 3:5), so his Gentile associations (Gal. 2) could not be held against him. However, when he got to that one word—just *one word*, mind you!—all hell broke loose (Acts 22:21), and if he had not been protected by Gentiles (Roman soldiers), he would have been torn to pieces by the mob, or stoned to death on the spot. It was ONE WORD that “tied the rag on the bush,” so to speak. The magic word was “**GEN-TILES.**” Observe again in Acts 26:23, 24 where the same word destroys the audience. *One word* is enough to destroy the peace of mind of some people, and in some cases, one word can cause an argument, a riot, mob violence, a lynching, looting, or perhaps even a war. Some words evidently have an “emotional content” all out of proportion to their length or their real meanings.

Up in Connecticut, in 1991, a black man was released from arrest (after a legitimate arrest with a legitimate warrant) and then was allowed to sue the policeman who arrested him because the policeman had spoken ONE WORD in retaliation for be-

ing cursed and called a "Mother....." and a "S.O.B." while the thief was *kicking* him in the crotch, swinging *haymakers* at him, and threatening (at the same time) to *kill the officer's family*. This brings up an interesting etymological question. If a "Nigger" is not a black thief who tries to maim and kill people while he is cursing them, what is a "Nigger"? The greatest "strong man" in America in the 1980's was named "Black Nigger" (*Arnold Schwarznegger*). Not one news outlet, including CBS, NBC, ABC, *Life* or *Time* magazines, *Reader's Digest*, *People*, *Esquire*, *The New Yorker*, or the Gannett newspapers, would tell one Englishman what the man's name was in English: *they all had to talk in tongues*. They had to stick with the German: the German means "Black Nigger."

Volatile, isn't it? Does it get a "rise" out of you?

Well, it couldn't raise your blood pressure unless you were "anti-intellectual."

If a man were truly a "scholarly intellectual" he would think nothing at all about what I just wrote. He wouldn't raise an eyebrow or clear his throat. Must be a "passel" of "anti-intellectuals" around, don't you think?

Now I have here given only one example among several hundred of how ONE WORD can set a field on fire (James 3:6) or a whole city. "Hussein" is not a popular word in *Kuwait* (1991). "Castro" didn't produce flag waving and cheering in *Miami* (1965). "Hitler" still doesn't go too well in *Tel Aviv*, or out by the Wailing Wall in Jerusalem. (Do you see what I mean, jelly bean?)

Some words are "magical." That is, they contain resident powers that can "reach out and grab ya." They are really and truly "magical" in the strictest sense of the word, for they perform supernatural tasks that are really quite impossible for letters on paper (or vocal sounds into the air) to perform. Magical: "any mysterious power that can produce ILLUSIONS: producing extraordinary results by unexplainable means." In short, "magic" is *anti-intellectual*. If a man were a true "intellectual" he would have no problem in approaching ANY word objectively without the slightest rise of blood pressure or increase of pulse rate. Under some circumstances where a phrase

is used an emotional reaction could be expected. For example: "I sentence you to be hanged by your neck until you are dead." For example. "Your son was killed in action." (Or, "Your husband is missing in action.") No man is going to yawn when a Catholic inquisitor (1500) says "Strap him to the rack," or a Viet Cong says (1970) "Take away his mosquito netting." It is impossible to avoid an emotional response to "Hold the s.o.b. down and if he doesn't talk we'll cut off his...." The latter was a common expression in 2000 B.C., 1500 B.C., 1000 B.C., 500 A.D., 800, 1500, 1700, 1800, 1939, 1944, 1950, 1970, and 1990. "Intellectualism" obviously has its limits. Still, one will have to admit that one word—just *one*—would have to be pretty "magical" to produce the results that Paul got from "Gentiles."

In our work on *The Damnation of a Nation* you should note "The Mark of the Jackass" (Chapter 3) and observe that what we call "double speak" (hypocrisy) in the press is simply an attempt by the editors, journalists, commentators, analysts, and reporters to take the *emotional content* out of a report by substituting words that will avoid raising the blood pressure: i.e., avoid offending anyone who is involved in stealing, killing, mugging, Communism, raping, extortion, fraud, blackmail, rioting, sex perversion, pornography, Socialism, prostitution, Bible-correcting, African music, jungle morals, looting, abortions, or federal prosecution of "Conservatives." "Double speak" is justified by what the clientele listed above calls "a sensitive treatment of the subject." This means "tone it down, shade it, shellac it, veneer it; tell it like it ain't." All news media "trucklers" operate in this fashion with the exception of a handful of writers like Tom Anderson, Charlie Reese, and McAlvany. "Sensitive treatment" simply means "don't ever talk *plainly*, because it will *upset* someone who is full of the Devil."

Evidently our country, from Seattle to Key West, is packed (from Maine to California) with emotionally unstable children whose "anti-intellectualism" is so deep and intense that they cannot be entrusted with THE TRUTH. The joke is that you never lived in an age where the college professors and college

graduates professed to have a more objective scientific "world view" than they do now. If you read the *National Geographic* magazine every month or *Scientific American*, you would think you were living in the most scholarly, scientific generation of objective intellectuals who ever showed up on this earth. If you had read *A Brief History of Time* by Stephen M. Hawking (Bantam Books, 1988) you would have thought that "modern man" was so objective and scientific that nothing could fool him, and nothing could upset him emotionally long enough to clear his throat. Hawking takes you from "The Big Bang" (which was never proved to have taken place) to "The Black Holes" (which have never been proved to be "collapsed stars" one time since the intellectuals retreated into fantasy in the "chambers of their own imagery" [Ezek. 8:12]).

Hawking (see Chapter 3) is rated as an intellectual of intellectuals, and is listed as such: "...writes with clarity and precision...a great thinker...a fine mind...the most brilliant theoretical physicist...his blazing intellect...guiding us expertly...it is difficult to think of anyone else living who could have put these mathematically formidable subjects more clearly...he has transformed our view of the universe...the ultimate quest for knowledge...."

What is the "meat" in the work? *Nothing*. The writer is an unsaved agnostic theorizing that if a man *like himself* (a "theorizer") gets a "complete theory" about the Universe then all mankind will be able to know "the mind of God." But to "know the mind of God" one must accept, as truth, accidental spontaneous generation of life—with the mathematical (see above) odds against it being *one out of ten to the 1300th power* (see *The Christian's Handbook of Science and Philosophy*). Hawking just does what all professional tradesmen do (see Chapter 2 in *The Damnation of a Nation*, 1991). He invents terms and borrows invented terms to explain what neither he nor his peers knew anything about (spins, virtual particles, singularity theorems, quarks, photons, light cones, neutrinos, neutron stars, event horizons, geodesics, anthropic principles, big crunches, big bangs, Chandrasekhar limits, pulsars, etc.) and then uses them as an alibi to reject Genesis 1-3 (see *The*

Christian's Handbook of Science and Philosophy, op cit., pp 161-174). God never revealed His "mind" to Stephen Hawking (or any of the men that he cites) in 187 pages of agnostic RUBBISH, though it was carefully put together in an intellectual framework of "double speak" that would make any news editor of *Life*, *Time*, CBS, NBC, or ABC proud of him. With a Book that contains more than *five hundred detailed prophecies* (prophesied more than four hundred years before any of them take place, and more than ninety percent of them still *future*) on the table in front of his wheel chair, Stephen cannot predict *one future event with any certainty*; not even the events that deal with his subject (*A Brief History of Time*). Heisenberg's "Uncertainty Principle" prevents him from knowing ANYTHING certain about ANYTHING.

This is in line with any modern scholar's MORAL outlook. An "open mind" means no *morals*, no *ethical standards*. You are "open" to anything. You feign "agnosticism" to avoid being put on the spot. See the excruciating psychological analysis of this operation in Matthew 21:23-27 where we learn WHY an educated scholar loves to profess "agnosticism." It is because he is an *emotional panic*, trying to cover up his sins. In regards to the "spur-of-the-moment" do-it-yourself vocabularies (such as the one given above), observe that this really is all that a Liberal Arts education is. Educators are tradesmen plying a trade and each part of the curriculum has a "trade" connected with it (Psychology, Psychiatry, Medicine, Law, Art, Music, Chemistry, Zoology, Astronomy, Biology, Archaeology, Political Science, etc.). Thus you can make money (\$\$\$) by forcing the "learner" to learn the terms. You deify the "trade" and connect it with a "god" (see the excruciating psychological analysis of this in Acts 19:25-28, written more than ten centuries before the Black Death). The reason why the "educated class" in Darwin's day responded so enthusiastically to his daydreams—and that is what they were—was because of their hatred for moral standards and fear of judgment *after death*. Bernard Shaw is quite honest in confessing this (cited in *Is Evolution Proved?*, D. Dewar and H. S. Shelton; Hollis and Carter, London, 1947, p. 4).

Blockheads, like all college professors who believe in evolution, forget that it was the Athenian Greek scholars of Paul's day who didn't want to face God after death, in judgment (see Acts 17). The Bible is always a good bit ahead of Dr. Theodosius Dobzhansky, George G. Simpson, Richard B. Goldschmidt, Stephen J. Gould, H. J. Muller, and Dr. Francisco Ayala, in these historical matters.

All the educated dumbbells of Darwin's day (as all the educated dumbbells of Einstein's day, and all the dumbbells of Dr. Preston Cloud's day—that last one was a geologist at the University of California, 1977) forgot that one of the prime motivators and instigators for scientific research is the *Adamic nature* in the researcher that is looking for alibies to justify his SINS (Prov. 18:1-3).

What kind of a scholar was Darwin? "The *only* college degree he ever earned was in Theology." Darwin was a theologian (Dr. Bert Thompson, *The History of Evolutionary Thought*, p. 104). "It is an interesting comment on the temper of the times and man's eagerness to discover a justifiable means of rejecting God as his Creator that the first edition of the "*Origin*" sold out before it was published" (op cit., p. 109). *Scholarship* was not involved. *Science* was not involved. Nothing *intellectual* or even *rational* was involved. What was involved was emotional panic of educated sinners over being held accountable to a Creator.

"The most significant fact about Darwin is not his stature as a scientist, but his influence as a symbol...." (Henry Morris, *the Troubled Waters of Evolution*, Creation-Life Pub., 1974, p. 53). "The people of that day [all of them educated people] had nothing else which was plausible. Darwin gave it to them" (Thompson, op cit., p. 111). "Give'em what they want." "Darwin lost his faith in Christianity and the miraculous BEFORE he had formulated his hypothesis of evolution...as his religious faith ebbed, his faith in evolution developed." *Scholarship* was not involved. "*Science*" and *intellect* were nowhere present: we are here dealing with FAITH; in this case, "*faith without works*." Darwin himself now confesses that his conversion from the Bible to nonsense was in "the chambers of his imagery"

(to cite the excruciating psychological analysis found in Ezek. 8:12, written more than eight hundred years before the Council of Nicea): "But I found it more and more difficult—with free scope given to my imagination—to *invent* evidence which would suffice to convince me. Thus DISBELIEF crept over me at a very slow rate, but at last was complete. The rate was so slow I felt no distress" (*Life and Letters*, Vol. 1, p. 277). Darwin says here that he gradually lost his faith in God and the Bible because he could find no evidence that God existed or the Bible was true.

The evidence for the Bible being true was *mathematical* (but Darwin was a "theologian" not a mathematician) and right in front of his face, and the evidence for the existence of God was in his *heart* and on his *lips* (Rom. 10:9, 10); all he had to do was put God to an observable, demonstrable scientific test (see John 7:17). But Darwin was not a scientist. He was an emotional "anti-intellectual." So he gave "free scope" to his imagination in the *opposite direction*; his theory was neither scientific, mathematical, nor demonstrable. It was RELIGIOUS. "Darwin was not a thinker and he did not originate the ideas he used...his ideas were not, as he imagined, unusually original" (Darlington, *Scientific American*, Vol. 201, p. 66). Of course they weren't.

Of course they weren't; they had been laid out more than two thousand years before Charles Darwin was born: Thales (640-546 B.C.), Anaximander (611-547 B.C.), Xenophanes (530-490 B.C.), Heraclitus (540-475 B.C.), Empedocles (490-435 B.C.), and Democritus (460-370 B.C.).

Whatever Charles Darwin was, there are seven things he was not.

1. A thinker.
2. A scholar.
3. A scientist.
4. An honest man.
5. An "intellectual."
6. A benefactor of mankind.
7. A Christian.

The mass of tradesmen's terms that have grown up around

the irrational, philosophical *guesswork* of this daydreamer will stagger the mind. That is the idea. Sinners disguise their ignorance and emotional panic by inventing words that people cannot understand. Witness: "protinases, saprotrophy, transglycosidation, Calvin cycle, protista, gametic reproduction, telephase, diplontic type, diplohaplontic type, sporulative, metaphase, anaphase, telophase, meiotic division, parasymphathetic, cholinergic, and semi-permeability." Impressive, ain't it? If you didn't know what was on a college campus you might think there were some "smart folks" there. There are thousands of *fornicators* there, there are hundreds of *drunkards* there, there are scores of *dope users* and *dope handlers* there, there are scores of *sex perverts* there, and there are mobs of International Socialists there, plus young men training to be doctors and lawyers who will clean you out of your house and home at the drop of a hat. I just gave you some high sounding foolishness from the University of Oregon (Robert M. Brenner, *Study Guide for Weisz' Science of Biology*, McGraw Hil, 1971).

Do you know what Dr. Robert Brenner knows about life and the past, present, and future of mankind, and his *own* future? Not one fool thing on the face of this earth. He is an Agnostic.

"Agnostic" is the Greek word for "IGNORAMUS" (Latin). The koine street language is "blockhead." Dumbbell; you atone for your lack of intelligence by constructing vocabularies that *look* impressive.

Whatever a modern twentieth century intellectual knows *that is SO*, was known in 90 A.D., *if it was something mankind needed to know*. Outside of this the intellectual actually knows NOTHING.

Now this maxim defines the position of your modern true "intellectual." It is the 400 B.C. position of an educated idiot (see *Science and Philosophy*, pp. 275-288), and we are speaking "sensitively" about the subject. A true "intellect" not only knows nothing (and *knows* that he knows nothing) but he thinks *no one else* knows anything either so he is anxious to find someone who thinks they know something—say Paul, for example (2 Tim. 1:12; Rom. 8:28-30, 38, 39; Phil. 3; 1 Thess. 4:11-16), or John, for example (1 John 3:24; 4:2, 6, 13, 16,

5:2, 13), or Peter, for example (1 Pet. 1:3-6; 2 Pet. 1:14)—and convince them that they are just like him: *ignorant*. A real "intellect," in the twentieth century, is simply a blockheaded idiot who has rejected the revelation of God while professing to be searching for "the mind of God," or if he is an atheist (which many of them are), he is professing to be "searching" for "truths." Hawking's book is a scholarly compilation of misinformation that concludes with an absolute BLANK. It couldn't have concluded in any other fashion. False start, false finish.

We will talk about this more later, but, for now, observe the dictionary meaning of three "magic words." These words are "intellectual," "scholars," and "scholarship." These are "heap big wampum," "heap big medicine!" These are three strong doses. They go with three other clowns who are not in the circus. 1. *Science*, 2. *Religion*, 3. *Philosophy*. But since we have already discussed these at great length (see *Science and Philosophy*, op cit.), we now turn to "Intellectual," "Scholars," and "Scholarship."

I. INTELLECTUAL "A man who is intelligent, one who shows high intelligence—who has the ability to reason and examine something objectively *without emotional considerations*."

When it comes to race-mixing, evidently there are no journalists, commentators, news editors, or newspaper publishers in the United States who are "intellectuals." High School and Middle School teachers are out, and evidently the whole NEA (in charge of education) is out. When the objective scientific facts were produced in regards to Negro intelligence ("intellect," IQ intelligence), the reaction of the "intellectuals" was *emotional panic*: emotional panic on the part of every member of Congress, every member of the NEA, and every newspaper editor in America. (See the definitive Ph.D.'s discourses by Garrett, Bolton, Carothers, Jarvick, Newman, Freeman, Bert, Corriol, Thomas, Gates, Holzinger, and Kimling, Garrett, *How Classroom Desegregation Will Work*, 1965.)

Those who professed to be objective, educated, enlightened, twentieth century "advanced" teachers turned out to be nervous, distraught, *anti-intellectuals*.

II. SCHOLAR: "A learned person; from 'school' and 'scholastic.' A student or pupil, coming from the Roman Catholic Dark Age concept of Aristotelian logic." Observe that a *scholar* is NOT a "teacher" by basic definition. The word has been misapplied for so long by Americans that the emotionally distraught "intellectuals" (see above) in America think that a "scholar" is a professional teacher—the *antithesis* of "student."

III. SCHOLARSHIP: "The systematized knowledge of a *scholar*; a description of the efforts or compiled works of a student, or teacher, as collated and presented by that individual." (The secondary meaning of course is a "grant" to someone to study something.)

Now, a man curses and invokes Deity ("G..d..." etc.) when he wishes to add weight or *authority* to what he is about to say. You call in (or conjure up) the supernatural powers of the Universe to "back up" what you are trying to prove; i.e. your opinion. "O Baal hear us!" (1 Kings 18:26-28). When some agnostic liar is trying to talk you out of your belief in Genesis 1 or Revelation 20-22, he appeals to his "gods" (Newton, Galileo, Einstein, Christensen, Maxwell, Lorentz, Hubble, Dieke, Peebles, Penzias, Wilson, Freidmann, Hoyle, Laplace, Kant, Planck, et al.). Since all man-following, man-worshipping humanists believe that "*man* is the measure of all things," it is only natural for them to conjure up *men* instead of God; humanists worship *mankind*. Their "gods" are men. When some agnostic relativist is trying to talk you out of your belief in absolute truth and final authority, as found in the Holy Bible, he will appeal to his "gods" (Robert Dick Wilson, Kittel, A. T. Robertson, Trench, Thayer, Nestle, Aland, Metzger, Hort, Wuest, Schaff, Hengstenberg, Delitzsch, Keil, Gesenius, et al. See *The Christian's Handbook of Biblical Scholarship*, 1989). *Saved* pragmatic humanists operate with the same set of principles and values that *unsaved* humanists believe in. More of this later.

Now to the Trifold Pantheon of famous pagan deities—Science, Religion, and Philosophy—there must be added three more: Intellectual, Scholars, and Scholarship. These deities will

be "invoked" wherever and whenever it is expedient to drive home or enforce a LIE. They must be called upon to add *weight* to the lie. As "deities," they take their place among the Pagan Trinity (Science, Philosophy, and Religion) and become "magic words," which can overcome the rational thinking powers of an ordinary man.

The trick is to get the observer (viewer, reader, or listener) to ABANDON the truth (John 17:17), on the spot, due to the power and weight of the "magic" word. The one word is supposed to automatically cancel any thoughts or ideas the reader (viewer or listener) may have had if those thoughts were contrary to the idea being presented. Put the word "scholarly" on a pamphlet by Stewart Custer or Robert Sumner and you are to ASSUME—without any further investigation—that the writing is to be taken seriously and *believed*. Put the word "godly scholarship" or "unquestioned scholarship" on a commentary by Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown, or a work by Benjamin Warfield, and you are to ASSUME—without any further investigation—that the work must be believed and *acted upon*. If a "scholar" wrote it—say the eight volumes of Church History by Phillip Schaff, or a book by F. F. Bruce—then it HAS to be true. Thus, these three magic words (Intellectual, Scholar, and Scholarship) have a utility that is absolutely awesome (fantastic!). When the word "godly," or "recognized," or "qualified," or "highly qualified" are added to them, they become omnipotent. They ascend "**the sides of the north**" (Isa. 14:13) and become "**like the most high**" (Isa. 14:14) exactly as Eve desired to do (Gen. 3:5).

Want to sell a bar of soap? Tell them that it was produced by "*scientific research*." Want to pawn off a corrupt Bible on someone? Tell them that "godly, Fundamental *scholars*" produced it. Want to get rid of Biblical Christianity in a nation? Tell them that "*all religions*" have much in common and should "get together." Want to get young men to abandon moral standards? Tell them that Einstein and Sartre were great "*intellectuals*." Want to destroy a young preacher's faith in the Holy Bible? Tell him that "reverent *Biblicists*" whose *scholarship* is "unquestioned" will teach him the Bible. It is "*science ad-*

vances forward rapidly," "modern *scientists* have learned," "a break-through in *scientific* technologies," "the *philosophies* of great thinkers," "existentialist *philosophy*," "a *philosophy* of life styles and values," "the great *philosophers*," "the varieties of *religious* experiences," "a history of *religions*," "a global view of *religion*," "modern *scholars* believe," "most *scholars* agree," "sound *scholarship*," "a *philosophy* of religion," "a *scholarly*, in-depth study," "high degree of *scholarship*," etc., that destroys a man's ability to reason and think. These phrases are the marks of the *real* ANTI-INTELLECTUAL. They are kosher cliches used to justify lies that range from spontaneous generation and "acquired characteristics" and pulsars, black holes, to International Socialism and twentieth century English versions of the Bible. (More on that later.)

Witness, for example, the "Voice of the Jackass": "To doubt evolution today is to doubt *science*, and science (1 Tim. 6:20) is only another name for THE TRUTH" (Othneil C. Marsh, Yale paleontologist, 1877). "Ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth." Ninety-five percent of the suckers who exchanged Genesis 1-3 for Darwin were educated suckers: *like the Yale professor*.

By now you have gathered something. We are evidently *judgmental*. We are evidently judging the content of someone's material (and calling it "lying" or "lies") by some standard. Exactly: that is exactly what we are doing. My subjective viewpoint is based on belief in the prejudices of Jesus Christ. He said in John 17:17 that God's word was TRUTH, and in spite of the fact that Pilate was an *anti-intellectual* who based his decisions on emotional content (John 19:8-10), when asked about TRUTH (John 18:38, 19:12), Christ said that He was "the truth" (John 14:6). I assume that He told the truth because He was the Truth. If you don't believe Him that's your business. "It's a free country." I assume He is telling the truth and thereby canceling those who "disagree" with Him (John 8:40-47). I retain my trust in Him after testing both Him and His words out through a period of forty-two years, and comparing my researches with the testimonies and researches of others who

tested Him and His words out for *nineteen centuries*. Among these will be found the most intellectual "intellect" in the world: Dr. Gerhard Dirks (1980), *a regenerated Christian with an IQ of 208*, which is a good bit above that of Max Planck or Albert Einstein.

Having made this assumption (in reality it is no more an "assumption" than the law of gravity or the laws of thermodynamics), I must also assume that where some liar deliberately contradicts Jesus Christ—as say, for example, *all evolutionists* do according to Mark 13:19, which Christ Himself spoke—they are NOT to be taken seriously; they are NOT to be believed, and they are NOT to be confused with anyone seeking the truth or looking for "truths." Furthermore, calling upon Baal, Ashtoreth, Hengstenberg, Mercury, Diana, John R. Rice, Mary, Joseph, Teutanes, Bel, Noel Smith, Jupiter or Milcom, Einstein, Gandhi, Joel Scherk, John Swartz, Jove, Laplace, Planck, Hubble, Hoyle, Venus, Alan Guth, Max Born, Allah, Westcott and Hort, Philip Schaff, Thor, Wilbur Pickering, et al., is not going to impress me. I find no "magic" in "intellect," "intellectual," "intelligence," "scholarship," or "scholars," as words. Paul said if man was an intellectual scholar (1 Cor. 1:21, 25) he would be wise to forget it (1 Cor. 3:18) and take his place with the "hillbillies" and the "red necks" (1 Cor. 2:1, 4). According to a medical doctor (Luke, Acts 22:3), Paul was one of the most "intellectual" of the "intelligensia" of his day (Phil. 3; Acts 22, 23).

Some words have a magical content; they hypnotize the reader, or the hearer. Adolph Hitler understood all of this perfectly; so do all popes. Want to take territory that is not yours? Cry "Liberate! Liberation! Unity! Unite!" Want to corrupt a whole town or state with moral degeneracy? Cry "Freedom! Pro-choice! Civil Rights!" If that won't do it, cry "Make love, not war! Love! Tolerance! Permissiveness! Liberty!" Want to turn a civilized country into a bankrupt jungle? Cry, "Integrate! Social justice! Equality! Fraternity! Brotherhood!" Want to escape detection when you are trying to control the entire world? Holler, "Peace! Fatherhood of God! Peace! Share and care! Peace!"

"The voice of the jackass is heard in our land" (see Song of Sol. 2:12).

Men invoke pagan gods to reinforce a lie.

The "gods" of the Moabites and Ammonites were "peace...and prosperity" (see Deut. 23:3-6).

"KIKE." There is a magic word. "WOP." There is another one. In the 1930's the magic word in Texas was "J. Frank Norris." Do you know how a member of the PLO responds to the word "ZIONISM"? Do you know how every journalist in America responds to "KU KLUX KLAN"? Exactly: like an hysterical old woman with an attack of diarrhea. Do you know what the response to "IAN PAISLEY" is at Notre Dame? I do. Do you know what magic there is in "JACK CHICK"? I do. You ought to try that one out before the Anti-Catholic Defamation League or the American Council of Catholic Bishops. "Limey," "Frog," "Boche," "Spick," "Greaser," "Wet Back," "Gook," "Wall Street," "Protocols," "International Bankers," etc. Volatile. Emotionally charged words that prevent "intellectuals" from rational and intelligent responses. If a man were a REAL "intellectual," none of those words would upset him long enough to take a baby aspirin, but evidently the network news media, the Christian universities, the news wire services, the staffs of Christian colleges, the major "dailies" and weeklies are not composed of INTELLECTUALS. "Intelligence" is not to be found among those who profess to be reporting facts; they must be reporting *fiction*. The secular press can offend any Bible believer or treat any Bible subject with vulgarity (and lack of "sensitivity") but they are very "caring" and "sensitive" when dealing with anyone whose moral standards, or ethical standards, or conduct, goes exactly *contrary* to what is found in the Book. (Since we have made thirty-two hours of cassette tapes demonstrating this truth it does not need to be demonstrated again here.)

Magic words: Bible, Mohammed, Jew, Zionism, Protocols, Khazars, Hunkies, Spades, M. L. King Jr., James Earl Ray, Lee Oswald, Marx, Einstein, Big Bang, Big Leap, Big Crunch, Relativity, Values, Sexuality, Gay, Queer, Fruit, Faggot, Pump,

Whore, Catholic, Fundamentalist, Wall Street Banker, CIA, NEA, NAACP, NCLU, Scholarship, KKK, Jungle Bunny, J. Frank Norris, Science, Northern Ireland, Nazi, Hitler, Gook, Jap, Cult, HEW, Supreme Court "Ruling," Urban Renewal, Niggers, Agrarian Reforms, Bourgeoise, Proletariat, Natural Selection, Scholars, Godly, Recognized, Qualified, Scripture, etc.

In Paul's day the magic word was "**Gentiles**" (Acts 22:21-22).

If you doubt our thesis, go into any Christian bookstore on the campus of any Christian school in America and try one word—just one will do fine. Try the magic word "**Ruckman**." Now go to any World Congress of Fundamentalism and try the same word—just one word, mind you, only ONE. See how volatile words are? "**Ruckman**" is actually just the name of one very nonconsequential, insignificant sinner who never claimed to be a "scholar" *one day in his life*. But to man-following, man-pleasing, men worshippers who believe that "man is the measure of all things," one man's name is enough to "upset the apple cart." Just one word: *Ruckman*.

"They gave him audience unto this word, and then lifted up their voices, and said, Away with such a fellow from the earth: for it is not fit that he should live" (Acts 22:22).

In this *Manifesto*, we shall talk about these genuine anti-intellectuals who brag about their intellects, their "qualified scholars," and their "recognized scholarship." We will prove (beyond the reasonable shadow of a doubt) that "scholarship," per se, has very little to do with truth or righteousness, and that scholars, *as a class of people*, are so emotionally prejudiced against truth that they can only be "**Ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth**" (2 Tim. 3:7). Much of this material will have to deal with so-called "Biblical Scholars" since most of them profess to be searching for *absolute* truths instead of *relative* truths. You will observe, in what follows, that all "recognized scholars" eventually come out at the same place whether they are Atheist or Catholic, Agnostic or Christian, Saved or Lost, Fundamentalist or Liberal. This is because all institutions of higher learning (colleges, univer-

sities, seminaries, etc.) are based on the same false foundation, for all have ONE goal in mind to start with: to create the maximum amount of *doubt* possible in the mind of the student as to the reality of *absolute truth*. In this respect, Bob Jones University, Baptist Bible College, and Pensacola Christian College are no different from Louisville Theological Seminary, the University of Chicago, or Colgate-Rochester Divinity School.

The trick in higher education is to deify *higher education* (\$\$\$). The trick in seminary studies is to maintain the deity of the *seminaries*. Absolute authority—especially in the sense of a Book that can be read and memorized—must be eliminated. Final authority must be invested in *higher education* (\$\$\$) itself, and whether this education is *Fundamental* (Tennessee Temple, Liberty University), *Neo-Evangelical* (Wheaton, Moody, Fuller), *dead Orthodox* (Mercer, Judson, Howard, Stetson), *Roman Catholic* (Notre Dame, Xavier, Loyola, etc.), *Liberal* (Colgate, Crozier, Harvard, Yale, etc.), or *Atheistic* (Berkley, Chicago, New York City College, Southern California, UCLA, etc), it has the same goal and it reaches the same destination, if by different Interstates and Overpasses. "All roads lead to Rome" (Rev. 17, 18). Rome has always had two conflicting authorities with both relative to a religious leader who plays "god" for the galleries.

In our next chapter we will show the reader how to spot a real "scholar," and having "spotted" him what to do with him. Naturally, in a work this brief, we cannot talk about all of the real European and Asiatic scholars from 400 B.C. to 1900 A.D., though there will be a few—a very few. As can be seen by what follows, the world has probably never produced more than forty scholars, of any brand, for what passes off as "scholarship" is simply the writings of men who borrowed from these men and then added a few thoughts of their own. There are not five *scholars* among the philosophers; for, philosophers don't really investigate, they rarely collate, they seldom prove anything, and their "thinking" most of the time is just a vacuous excursion into "cloudland" which amounts to little more than daydreaming. There are not ten real scholars among the artists or among the musicians and there are not more than a dozen

among the historians or translators; they deal with the records and works of others.

In this work the word "scholar" is used the way the professional tradesmen use it (see *The Damnation of a Nation*, Chapter 2). It does not refer to a *student* who is engrossed in studying something—as the term originally was used—but rather to an "expert" in a field who has come to be "recognized" as an expert in that field and therefore QUALIFIED to *teach* students. But in this work, a real "scholar" must not only have *mastered* his subject, but he should be able to produce some tangible evidence that the years spent in mastering the subject were not in vain but fruitful for mankind in a *positive* sense: that is, if he did not master something that enabled men to live better and die better than they have been doing since recorded time, his "scholarship" was nothing more than just a good way for him to make a living (\$\$\$). That is, he was an *opportunist*. A scholar is supposed to be intellectual and *rational*. If any scholar cannot think clearly enough to desire to improve man's lot on this earth while is here (even if he doesn't believe in an after-life) then he is not a SCHOLAR: he is a selfish egotist. *His thinking is cloudy*. He is really "anti-intellectual."

So before we run off half-cocked into "Scholars and Scholarship," let us remind ourselves of a great absolute truth spoken by THE TRUTH (John 14:6): "**By their fruits ye shall know them**" (Matt. 7:20). A scholar who spent eighty years studying something (take Karl Menninger of Topeka, Kansas, for an example) and then could not find the truth (2 Tim. 3:7), or give the truth to anyone else (John 17:17) is to be taken with a ton of bicarbonate of soda if one is talking about "great intellects" and "recognized scholarship." No one here is going to be intimidated by the "scholarship" of a glorified ape who doesn't know where he came from, why he is here, where he is going, how he is going to get there, or what he is supposed to be doing while on the trip. I mean, after all, enough comedy is enough comedy for one day. If a "scholar" can't tell you where he came from, why he is here, or where he is going, how in the world could he tell you what YOU should be doing while YOU are here? There is nothing funnier than a college

educated scientist (who swears by evolution) "moralizing" on social values, religious teachings, social conduct, ethical standards, governmental policies, equal rights, social justice, or "values." These monkey men are in a class by themselves; Laurel and Hardy, Jonathan Winters, Jackie Gleason, Red Skelton, Abbot and Costello, and the Three Stooges couldn't run on the same track with them.

The pre-Darwinian "pro-Simians" (Mauperuis (1690-1775), Carle Linne (1707-1778), Georges Louis DeBuffon (1707-1788), Georges Cuvier (1769-1832), Sir Richard Owen (1804-1892), James Hutton (1726-1797), A. B. Werner (1749-1817), Erasmus Darwin (1731-1802), set up rules and theories which have been since proved on at least 500,000 occasions, to be PIPE DREAMS. These are the principles and "proofs" upon which all theories of evolution are based. Not one of them is *scientific* and not one of them is *demonstrable*. When Charlie got all through building his false system on these false foundations, he came out exactly where Einstein, Born, DeVries, and Hawking came out: into a black hole. "I feel as if my books came half out of Sir Charles Lyell's brains [Lyell didn't have any brains] .I see no evidence of beneficent DESIGN of any kind, in the details ..[i.e. Darwin was *blind*]. . But the more I *think* the more bewildered I become.. [so is every nut who follows you, Cheetah] .I think that generally (and more as I grow older), *but not always*, that an AGNOSTIC would be the more correct description of my mind" (*The History of Evolutionary Thought*, Dr. Bert Thompson, 1981, pp. 117, 135, citing Boller, *American Thought in Transition; The Impact of Evolutionary Naturalism*, Rand McNally, 1969, pp. 117, 135).

The word "AGNOSTIC" is the Greek word for "ignoramus" (Latin): a non-knower.

Darwin: "Again, I say I am, and shall ever remain in a *hopeless muddle*" (Aug. 8, 1860, letter to Huxley) *Amen*

If "the only thing they know is that they know nothing," then for Heaven's sake don't put them in any place of responsibility like the NEA, where they can create a whole generation of people who are as stupid as they are. (See *Science and Philosophy*, *op cit.* pp. 64, 65).

CHAPTER TWO

How To Spot a "Scholar"

The word "scholar" has been so abused and misused (since around 1600 somewhere) that today the word (like "science" and "Christian") means about anything. It means whatever you want it to mean. The word "Christian" (Acts 11:26) *originally* meant someone who had forsaken all to follow a Man (Matt 19:27-29) and such following was marked by *ridicule* and *persecution* (John 16:18-23) outside the religious environment of contemporary society (Heb. 13:10-14). It also involved cross bearing, the shameful death of a *naked criminal* to the public (Matt. 27:39-40). In the twentieth century the term can mean:

1. A *billionaire* on a throne who is "coronated" with a crown where he begins a "reign" (all popes).
2. A *Communist* who was a polytheist and claimed he could expiate people from their sins (Mohatma Gandhi)
3. A fornicating *Marxist* whose life was so vile that not even his friends and supporters could look at the written record of it (Michael King Jr.).
4. An *interdenominational kiddy school* with an income of over five million dollars a year where no one witnesses or wins souls, and no one puts Christ or the Bible ahead of their friends, supporters, or their "testimony."
5. A variety of drug addicts, Charismatics, and welfare workers (along with "bleeding-heart liberals" and "pablum pukes") who don't believe in Heaven, Hell, soul-winning, regeneration, the New Birth, or the Second Advent

A real "Christian" in 1990 would be ashamed to use the term in referring to himself, in America, it connotes NOTHING; *nothing at all.*

- Conversively, the word "scholar" has come to mean
1. A man who has memorized fifty words that the average person doesn't know.
 2. A teacher at a school who publishes a few booklets or books about what he is teaching in class
 3. A philosopher who theorizes on what "might" have happened if "appearances" that "suggest" certain implications "could be" interpreted as such-and-such.
 4. A man who gets a "Nobel" prize for guessing something that fitted into someone's previous guess that proves the first guess was right *if both guesses aren't proved wrong by a subsequent guess.*
 5. A dictionary or thesaurus (or lexicon) put together by several editors.
 6. A history, biography, or autobiography written by any writer using material already available in a number of publications.
 7. A critique of a Bible version, or collection of "word studies," to prove the *Authorized Version* needs to be revised.
 8. Another version of the English Bible, after two hundred (since 1700) have come and gone without any improvement in the moral condition of any individual, church, or nation on earth
 9. Someone who contributes articles to an omnibus of information (*Encyclopedia Britannica, Encyclopedia Americana, Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, Nicean, Ante-Nicean and Post-Nicean Fathers, etc.*).

"Scholar," in Christian circles today, is never applied to any teacher, preacher, minister, student, or professor until he publicly attacks the *King James Bible*. This is the *first* requirement—an absolute essential—for earning the coveted title of "scholar." There are no scholars admitted to the "Union" if they leave the *King James* text as it stands. You cannot be a Christian "scholar" and believe in absolute authority or the final authority of any book on the face of this earth. *This is an iron-clad rule accepted by all scholars in the Union.* Ed-

ward Hills will never join the ranks of Tischendorf, Hort, and Nestle because he would not publicly correct the *Authorized Version*. True, after his death, the pseudo scholars have to quote him to prove different things, but they never admit him into the Union. He, like Dean Burgon, was always considered as an "afterthought." No major scholar in Britain, Europe, or America pays any attention to Edward Hills or Dean Burgon. You will not find Clarence Larkin listed in *Who's Who in Church History*, (Elgin Moyer) although he influenced more than ten times as many prophetic expositors as Lindsay, Kirban, Webber, Rockwood, Pentecost, Newell, or Scofield.

Now to obtain a Ph D., a "scholar" is required to construct a "thesis." This "thesis" is for the purpose of determining how *original* the scholar is, how much *research* he will carry out, how many "source" references he will dig up, how carefully he will *examine* and use these, how thorough he will be in his *analysis* of them, and how adept he will be at *proving* his "thesis" from the material thus gathered. My thesis at BJU was "A History Of Practical Theology In The Light Of The Book Of The Acts Of The Apostles." My "thesis" was simple: I set out to prove that no matter what a Christian PROFESSES (belief in the fundamentals, love for God, belief in the "verbal, plenary inspiration of the scriptures," orthodoxy, a militant stand for the fundamentals, "infallible, original autographs," etc.), if that Christian is not actively engaged in trying to win lost sinners to Jesus Christ, *that Christian* (be he Doctor, Master, Apprentice, Reverend, Bishop, Archbishop, Litt. D., D. D., Pope, "Father" or "Pastor") is a **HERETIC**.

You can imagine how that Doctoral dissertation went over with Neal, Custer, Bob Jones Jr., and the rest of the dead orthodox, backslidden faculty members at BJU! That was in 1953; they have had forty-seven years to go downhill since then.

The "thesis" must be occupied always (and primarily) with RESEARCH. The scholar must be perfectly acquainted with his subject. Thus, a scholar in Biology is NOT a scholar in European History; a scholar in Physics is not a scholar in Mid-Victorian Poetry. A scholar in Greek is not a scholar in Military Tactics, etc. Occasionally, a sort of "genius" will show up

whose scholarship extends into more than one field, but rarely more than *two* at the most. Leonardo DeVinci (1452-1519) was not a scholar of anything: he was inventive and had a few original thoughts and he was a pretty good draftsman. His good "press" converted him into an artist. He was a fair painter and a fair sketcher but that was about it. Gustav Dore could outsketch him any day of the week, and *Wyeth* and *Parrish* could outpaint him as far as the east is from the west.

The outstanding mark of any scholar in *any* field is the amount of time and effort that he puts into researching his subject in order to master it. The only "search warrant" given in the Holy Bible itself was to research *scripture*: "Search the scriptures...they searched the scriptures daily" (John 5:39, Acts 17:11).

In the Old Testament there is a man whose name (Agur) means a "collector of wise sayings" (Prov. 30:1). You will notice that the preacher who "sought to find out acceptable words" (Ecc. 12:10) no sooner found out "that which was written was upright, even words of truth" (notice the plural: Ecc. 12:10), than the Scholar's Union transvested him into a "scholar" (see *NKJV*, Ecc. 12:10), whereas the Holy Scriptures had him listed as a "preacher."

You'd better think about *that* two or three years before you buy an *NIV* or *NASV*; they both converted the "preacher" into a *teacher*. They got rid of the pastor in the local church who was preaching a Bible, and replaced him with one of their own faculty members who didn't believe THE WORDS (see Ecc. 12:10, 11) were God's words. The context, by the way, was "many books" (Ecc. 12:12).

You see, a Bible scholar would have to spend time in *the Bible* in order to master his subject—the Bible. This would automatically disqualify ninety percent of the members of every translating committee for English Bibles since 1800. They didn't spend their time in the Bible; they spent it with Hebrew and Greek "word studies," Hebrew and Greek lexicons, the critical theories of Bible-rejecting philosophers, scientists, "manuscript detectives," and pro-Catholic "theorizers." Research into Baur's *Historische Grammatik Der Hebraischen Sprache*,

Moulton and Milligan's *The Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament*, F. F. Bruce's *The Books and the Parchments*, F. M. Cross' *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, F. G. Kenyon's *Our Bible and Ancient Manuscripts*, or G. R. Driver's *Semitic Writing, from Pictograph to Alphabet* is not BIBLE study. If scholars are present they are NOT "Bible" scholars.

Research and *collation* are the outstanding marks of the real scholar in any field. The trick, when buying books, is to find the men who have done the most research and collated the most material and then use this material. This way you can save thousands of dollars in building a library. When it comes to the Bible itself, no man has to buy more than eighty books to learn everything about the Book that anyone ever found out (or probably ever will find out) up to the Rapture "You can borrow brains but you can't borrow character," hence we can borrow material from the world's greatest scholars who often had no intelligence at all when it came to *Biblical truth*. Scholars can research, experiment, theorize, test, analyze, and record till they are blue in the face, but if they are not born again (1 Cor. 3) the Book says they will be **"Ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth."**

The ability to gather facts is not the ability to interpret facts. The ability to collect details is not the ability to relate them correctly. The ability to analyze Greek and Hebrew words, to take them apart, construct them, trace their origins and roots, and relate them to other languages is not the ability to *understand* the Author of speech, or even what the Author of speech SAID (2 Pct. 1 21) See *The Damnation of a Nation*, pp. 65). Etymological "know-how" is not soul-winning know-how (see p 121). A "sense of history" doesn't mean the author has any *common sense*, and a knowledge of Biblical languages doesn't mean the scholar can grasp one fundamental truth in sixty-six books where it contradicts his opinions or beliefs. Ezekiel 14 and 2 Thessalonians 2 assure us that not even the seeker after the truth, or the inquirer after facts, can find either if a *wrong heart* condition exists that God knows about (Ezek 14:1-12). Since there is not one "recognized" scholar who ever lived who acknowledged this Biblical truth—it contradicts their opin-

ions and beliefs—you may assume that ninety-five percent of the intellectuals who professed to be “Biblical” scholars were nothing but *deluded egotists*.

Years ago (1950) John R. Rice used to preach a sermon called *The Seven-Fold Sin of Not Winning Souls to Christ*. One point that he made was that in view of Proverbs 11:30, a man who didn’t win souls to Christ was a “short-sighted fool.”

Did you ever think how that sermon would have struck the Christian scholars between 1800 and 1990 who produced all the modern trash (*NIV, NASV, ASV, RSV, NRSV, RV, NKJV*) that is on the market today? “A short-sighted fool?” Isn’t that some way to talk about Zane Hodges, Millar Burrows, Wilbur Pickering, Reuben Olson, Bob Jones IV, Arthur Farstad, Kurt Aland, and Bruce Metzger? “A short-sighted fool!” What was Rice’s authority for calling the greatest Christian intellects of the twentieth century “short-sighted fools”? My, how rude of “good, godly, kind, Dr. John!” Do you know who this would have included if it were so? B. M. Metzger, H. Von Soden, Eberhard and Erwin Nestle, Fred Afman, James Price, R. M. Grant, Kenneth Wuest, Wilbur Pickering, Philip Schaff and all of their friends and associates.

“Short-sighted fools.”

How does a brilliant Christian intellectual who majored in “Biblical scholarship” wind up as a “short-sighted fool”?

Easy; he pretends that Proverbs 11:30 was either written for *someone else* or else it was written wrongly. (See the *RSV* for the latter viewpoint) John R. Rice further said that if a scholar was not winning souls to Christ he was not following Christ (Matt 4:19). And if that weren’t enough, he said the scholar was guilty of *spiritual manslaughter* (Ezek. 3). How did John R. Rice (who professed to be a “scholar”) ever draw such a judgment on A. Harnack, Gerhard Strauss, F. F. Bruce, Ronald Walker, Dick Melton, Doug Kutilek, Robert Sumner, Gary Hudson, E. J. Bultmann, G. W. Anderson, MacRae, Newman, Professor Nida, and the *NIV* and *NASV* committees? What peculiar standard was John Rice judging “godly” Christian scholarship by? He was judging it by a *King James Authorized Version* (1611).

If he was right, would you follow any intellectual—of any degree, or any ability—knowing he was a fool with blood on his hands, because he was not following Jesus Christ? *I trow not.*

You see, from a *Biblical* standpoint—and all the men above were “recognized Biblical scholars”—scholarship and scholars are not essential things at all; they are not even *valuable*. Their value depends only on the amount of material they accumulate that is SO, and what can be done with this material to improve the living conditions, or the dying conditions, of their fellow men. If the *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* cannot help a man live closer to Jesus Christ than he does, and cannot prepare him for death and the Judgment Seat of Christ in better condition than he would have been without it, it is from a Biblical standpoint—shall we dare say the word?—WORTHLESS. The fact that it took twenty-three years to complete and it contains the accumulated works and researches of seven hundred qualified authorities doesn’t “do the job” from a *Biblical* standpoint if it doesn’t cause the salvation of sinners, the edification of the saints, and the magnification of the words of God (Psa. 138:2, Acts 13:48). The Bible has its own standards of “scholarship.” It also has a great deal to say about *scholars* (Luke 11; Isa. 28, 29; Psa 119; Ecc. 12; 1 Cor. 1-3, and Prov. 1, 9, 10, 13, 15, 22, 24, and 29).

Proverbs 18:1-3 says that one reason a sinner researches and researches is because he wants to find *an alibi to sin*. Proverbs 17:24 says that another reason why Hoyle, Hubble, Hawking, LaPlace, Einstein, Planck, and Heisenberg spent so much time with immeasurable distances, invisible objects, and unreal situations was because they were FOOLS. Paul says such fools PROFESS to be wise (Rom. 1:22). I’ll never forget the day at BJU when I pulled Proverbs 18:1-2 on Dr. Barton Payne (1952) and his followers! You talk about ducks on a pond dodging lightning!

At any rate, a scholar is primarily the *researcher* and *collater*. Secondly, he is an interpreter, and thirdly, he is a prophet. *Prophecy* will always be his weakest point and his poorest “showing.” Having rejected absolute truth—which contains more than five hundred future unfulfilled prophecies—

his "predicting" will be a pretty sorry affair. Einstein predicting about the future of the human race or the Universe, or Sarte predicting about world peace or life after death is really just too pitiful to talk about (Sarte was not a scholar or close to one. He was a poetic philosopher without a brain in his head.) Any child in a DVBS at the Landmark Baptist Temple (say ages 12-14) could predict the future better than Einstein or Sarte.

Now I'll give you one example of a scholar; this is an unsaved Russian who received little or no notoriety for his works, and will certainly never be given the credit that is given to men like Hegel, Spinoza, Fichte, Schelling, Heidegger, Sarte, and Kierkegaard (see *Science and Philosophy*, Chapter 9), although none of these bull shooters were real scholars. They majored in muddled thinking that was detached from reality and completely disassociated from anything constructive in the lives of individuals, communities, countries, or nations

Here is a certain Immanuel Velikovsky (1965) who wrote *Eodipus and Akhnaton*, *Earth in Upheaval*, *Ages in Chaos*, and *Worlds in Collision* (Delta Books). Mr. Velikovsky will remain a "dark horse" in the Scholar's Union for the simple reason that he was what is called a "Catastrophic Geologist." A catastrophic geologist is a man who thinks that the Disneyworld chart on evolution—used by all teachers in all public schools (and found in all textbooks) from Grade School to Post Graduate School—is a farce. He does not believe in "uniformitarianism"—a religious faith established by Paley, Lyell, Smith, Darwin, and Huxley back in the nineteenth century. When you place Velikovsky's documented evidence (which he researched thoroughly) alongside something, say, like Darwin's *Origin of the Species* or *The Descent of Man*, you become painfully aware of the fact (if you are a monkey man) that one man was a diligent, painstaking researcher while the other was an *irresponsible dreamer* in cloudland. It is like laying Dean Burgon's *The Causes of the Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Gospels* alongside Westcott and Hort's Introduction in *The New Testament in the Original Greek*. Or (in another vein) laying a military history by Lindell Hart alongside a novel by Hermann Wouk.

Pick up a small volume by Velikovsky (say, *Worlds in Col-*

lision, less than four hundred pages) and up pops source references from Isaac Newton, Laplace, Jeans, Jeffreys, and Russell on the solar system, with such annotations as "by Lyttleton and, independently, by Russell." Here are citations from Hesiod, Anaximenes, Anaximander, and then *Die Religionen des alten Iran* (German), *Die Himmelsreise der Seele* (German), *Sources de l'histoire primitive du Mexique* (French), *Catalogue des bolides et des aeriothese observes a la Chine et dans les pays voisins* (French), *The Surya-Siddhanta* (Hindu), *Wen-Tze in Texts Taoistes* (Chinese, trans by C. de Harlez, 1891). In this "package" one finds excerpts from Chinese mythology, the writings of Philo and Herodotus, Plutarch and Pliny, the writings of Origen, Ovid, and the Jerusalem Talmud, plus works on Brahmanism, Hinduism, the Bundahis (Pahlavi Texts), Virgil, Augustine, and the Aryabhatiya of Aryabhatta (Hindu). Then there appears in the footnotes one hundred German, French, and English authors who deal with Babylonian and Greek mythology, planets and astronomy, Maya and Aztec civilizations, the relation of Greek to Hieroglyphics, Sumerian and Babylonian Psalms, magic versus experimental science, geology, and *The Book of the Dead*.

Somebody spent some time in a library.

Westcott and Hort, alongside Velikovsky, were two jokers in the same deck. Hort's "monumental researches" (to prove his theories) amount to eight verses in the New Testament (conflate theory) and not one scrap of evidence of *any* kind, from *anywhere*, to prove *any* New Testament text had ever been "conflated" ("Lucian Recension") by *anyone*. You say, "Well, they were in a different branch of scholarship." Precisely; Westcott and Hort were fooling with the Holy Bible, and therefore, should have been at least ten times as meticulous and studious as Velikovsky, who was not even a professing Christian. With eight verses quoted to prove a "thesis," what *anti-intellectual blockhead* would have accepted Hort's "scholarship" as "qualified" or "thorough"?

Easy every major Bible teacher and Christian scholar on the American continent (1880-1980).

The ASV of 1901 and the NASV of 1959 both followed

Westcott and Hort's theories to the letter. They were both recommended by the faculty and staff of every single major Conservative and Fundamentalist school in America where that institution majored in "higher learning."

They wanted reputations as scholarly, academic institutions so they paid the price (\$\$\$). The price was following the blind guides into a ditch.

Will Durant (contemporary) is a scholar. His eleven volumes on *The Story of Civilization* (the last five in conjunction with Ariel Durant) run over five thousand pages and are well researched and well annotated. His book on *The Lessons of History* (after writing eleven volumes of history) is in a class with Calvin and Hobbes, Krazy Kat, the Marx Brothers at the Opera, and *No Time for Sergeants*, or perhaps *The Complete Jack the Ripper* (Donald Rumbelow, N.Y. Graphic Society, 1975). "The bigger the belfry, the more room for the bats." Durant doesn't believe any Bible has anything in it God said to anybody; he makes no profession of conversion to Christ, no profession of faith in God or Christ, and has no assurance of life after death for himself or anyone else. Will Durant, after writing eleven volumes of *The Story of Civilization* (plus *The Story of Philosophy*, *Transition*, *Adventures in Genius*, and *The Pleasure of Philosophy*) can't tell one soul on the face of this earth on seven continents through six thousand years of recorded history where he *came from*, how he *got here*, where he *is going*, or what he is going to *find* when he gets there. He got this stupid by rejecting the contents of sixty-six books written more than five hundred years before Columbus discovered America.

"All the clowns are not in the circus."

We have come across two "red neck" axioms which we had better memorize. 1. "The bigger the belfry, the more room for the bats." 2. "All the clowns are not in the circus." We may add a third from "Ruckman's Laws": "If you ain't got no edjcation, you jes gotta use yo brains." Higher learning of any quaity, or profession, has only one goal in mind *to produce as much doubt as possible in the mind of the student as to absolute truth and the final authority of a BOOK.* Westcott

and Hort assisted conservative colleges and seminaries in obtaining that objective. You will notice (see above) that John R. Rice—who never was close to being a scholar a day in his life—used ONE BOOK with which to put down the Scholar's Union, although it included men in whom he believed and followed. But Rice's Book designated them as "following Christ afar off," with "bloody hands," being guilty of "the folly of short sighted fools." I use that one Book for the same purpose, so does every real Bible-believing American who ever lived. Rice was a tractarian evangelist, so when he "got to preachin'" he forgot his scholarly pretense and his attempts to get into the Scholar's Union (ditto Spurgeon). Instead, he told *the truth*. "The truth," evidently, has very little to do with "Christian scholarship." It was Billy Sunday who said "If scholarship says one thing and the Bible says another, scholarship can go plumb to the devil." In my "modern, up-to-date translation" (in the "koine American" of the twentieth century) I have re-phrased this for "communicators" and "receptors" as follows: "If godly Christian scholarship says one thing and the Holy Bible says another, then "godly" Christian scholarship can go home to Hell where it belongs." (I have always tried to be a little more *exacting* in my "scholarship" than Billy Sunday!)

Can you spot a "scholar"? I can. Here is one. This is Charles Augustus Briggs (1844-1913), a defrocked Presbyterian minister who became an Episcopalian. Briggs helped produce the definitive English edition of *Gesenius' Hebrew Lexicon* and with the help of Driver and Plummer he edited the *International Critical Commentary Series*, plus the *International Theological Library* (with S. D. F. Salmond). When Briggs writes on *The Study of the Holy Scripture* (Baker Book House, 1900, 1970) he will tell you what H. R. Ryle says, what Van Oosterzee says, what Vitranga and Brian Walton say, as well as what B. B. Warfield, B. Weiss, S. P. Tregelles, A. Tholuck, Tertullian, H. B. Swete, and Tyndale have to say. There is nothing confined or "narrow minded" about Briggs. He cites E. H. Palmer, Papias, Coverdale, Isaac Borner, W. P. Dubose, H. Ewald, A. Carlstadt, T. K. Cheyne, William Bousset, Elzevir, C. H. Toy, A. Schultens, F. H. Scrivener, J. S. Semler. And then,

just to make sure no one gets "left out" or feels lonely, he cites Daniel Whitby, L. Zuntz, Zwingli, Richard Bentley, Theodore Beza, G. Bickell, J. Clericus, J. Coccecius, Friedrich Delitzsch, Franz Delitzsch, J. G. Eichhorn, Charles Hodge, H. J. Holtzmann, H. Hupfeld, Kautsch, Klaussen, Kuenen, Largarde, Fisher, Hadrian, Gratz, Havernick, Herder, Rashi, Perowne, and E. Nestle.

There isn't one faculty member of one Conservative college, seminary, or university in America who had access to any more information than Charles Briggs had when he wrote. Do you know what was wrong with Charlie? His position on the scripture was *identical* to the one being taught at Bob Jones University in 1990 (see Briggs, *op cit.* pp. 610-648). *He was defrocked for heresy* (1893). In those days the Presbyterian church was "militant." The long tenure apostates at Union Theological Seminary voted to keep Briggs at the cost of severing the seminary from the Presbyterian church. As the Board of Directors of Baylor University (1990-1991) managed to take a whole school away from the churches that founded it (the Baptists in their case), so Union Theological Seminary decided that "academic freedom" to attack the words of the Holy Bible was more important than believing them and teaching them. *A whole seminary went into total apostasy to protect one Bible-rejecting TEACHER.* In Judges, a whole tribe (Benjamin) was nearly wiped out to protect the "freedom" of a handful of faggots (Judg. 20:11-14) in that tribe.

Briggs' scholastic output was at least ten times the volume of any three teachers at Bob Jones, Tennessee Temple, BBC, Santa Rosa, Pensacola Christian, and Liberty University, combined. He wrote *Theological Symbolics*, *Biblical Study*, *American Presbyterianism*, *The Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch*, *The Incarnation of the Lord* (he was a "Fundamentalist" like Westcott and Hort), *The Ethical Teachings of Jesus*, *The Authority of the Holy Scriptures* (that was the theme of Bob Jones University's "World Congress" a few years ago; see *The Christian's Handbook of Biblical Scholarship*, pp 180-183), *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Psalms*, *The Fundamental Christian Faith*, *The Messiah of the Gospels*, and *The History of Theology*.

He was a short-sighted fool.

He was also a professing Christian.

"In spite of his reputation for radicalism" he (Briggs) was "thoroughly conservative EXCEPT in the field of Biblical Criticism" (*Who's Who in Church History*, Moyer, p. 58). Ditto every member of every translating committee since Briggs' birth (1841). If you keep long tenure Bible critics on your staff your school will eventually become an interdenominational roosting place (Matt. 13:32) for *unsaved* scholars. That is the history of Harvard, Oxford, Cambridge, Yale, Princeton, Dartmouth, Columbia, Baylor, Union Theological Seminary, Stetson, Judson, Mercer, Crozier Theological Seminary, Pensacola Christian College, Cedarville, Grace Theological Seminary, BIOLA, Colgate-Rochester, Pacific Coast, BBC, and Bob Jones University. All you need is "time." In enough time, short-sighted fools with bloody hands (see above) will control the Board of Trustees and the Board of Directors. Lee Roberson (Chattanooga, Tenn.) found that out the hard way. Bob Jones IV is learning it.

Two things should be apparent. A real "scholar" is a *bookworm*; he must spend hours, days, weeks, and months at a study desk or writing table. He will have little or no time for sports, fishing, hunting, art, music, soul winning, hospital visitation, church building, or marrying and burying folks. Men with large works like Swindoll, MacArthur, Shuller, and Hyles are NEVER scholars. There are no real scholars who pastor large churches. Thieme, MacArthur, and pseudo scholars like them, are nothing but amateur psychologists who specialize in reaching wealthy middle class Christians who delight in thinking about themselves and their own personal problems, ditto Gothard, Dobson, etc. They make a good living. "Scholarship" is not in their line. They are not close to it. The inexperienced and naive (ninety percent of all American professing Christians since 1940) presume such characters are "scholarly" because they use *terminology* from computers, the "social sciences," and the NEA to clothe their messages with. Thieme and MacArthur are about as "scholarly" as Oral Roberts or Rex Humbard.

The second thing that should now be apparent is that "Biblical scholarship" is a misnomer when applied to destruc-

tive Bible critics, who know little or nothing about the *content* of the Bible; at least they cannot understand or grasp the content of the Book in their own language. Charlie Briggs did NOT spend a lifetime reading the Bible to see what it SAID; he spent a lifetime altering it to make it say *what he wanted it to say*. Ditto Kenneth Wuest, A. T. Robertson, Wilbur Pickering, Zane Hodges, Spiros Zodhiates, James Price, Harold Willmington, Stewart Custer, Harold Ockenga, and their friends and associates. A "Bible" scholar should have spent a lifetime with the Bible and he should have mastered ninety percent of it if he professes to be (or is recognized as) a "Biblical" scholar. More of *this* later.

A genuine scholar is a *researcher*. He is a Greek or Hebrew scholar if he spends a lifetime researching Hebrew and Greek words, grammar, idioms, sources, developments, and uses. He is an Historical scholar if he spends a lifetime studying history, historians, and histories. He is a Theological scholar if he spends a lifetime studying Systematic, Dogmatic, Practical, and Biblical Theology: i.e. the doctrinal truths taken from the Bible and other religions. A real scholar would spend from four to six hours a day, three hundred days a year investigating, READING, and taking notes and writing out what he discovered. A real scholar would have to read at about a rate of five to seven hundred words a minute (less in a foreign language) to do a really thorough job of a subject, say in ten years. Of course, the subject matter would determine how much time was necessary. A scholarly thesis on *The Relationship of the Ribosomes in the Cytoplasm to the RNA Messengers* could be done in a few months with perhaps eighty citations from thirty authentic sources. On the other hand, a scholarly treatment of *The Critical Apparatus in Nestle's Greek New Testament between 1890 and 1990* would take a fairly gifted scholar about ten years, using three hundred different sources and citing more than one hundred authors. You spot a scholar by the *time* he spends in researching his "thesis," the *care* that he takes to quote his sources correctly, the *manner* in which he collates and combines these sources, the *conclusions* that he draws from these sources, and finally (for the Bible believer, at least) how these conclusions appear






CLEANSING THE TEMPLE: OIL "DEM OF THIEVES"

"NEVER MIND THAT
 JUNK WE THREW INTO
 THE WASTE BASKET!
 WE'RE GOING TO GIVE
 YOU THE FACTS OF
 — LIFE!"



THE FACTS OF LIFE ARE IN THE WASTE BASKET!

"GOD BLESS YOU, BROTHER!"



A GROUP OF "GODLY," RECOGNIZED, "BIBLICAL" SCHOLARS

when laid alongside *absolute truth* and *final authority*. Since the Scholar's Union (the reputed "intellectuals") have no final authority higher than their own opinions and preferences—and no absolute truth of any kind—their *conclusions* are SAND ROPES. They can't support anybody or anything. They are "bruised reeds" (2 Kings 18:21) and are only useful in making temporary progress towards a One-World, Global Kingdom of Death and Hell under Satan (see Isa. 28:15, 18; Rev. 13; Zeph. 3:8-9; and Isa. 30:8-13).

I am not a scholar. I have never professed to be one, but I know one when I see one. You do not have to be one to know one. You don't have to swim through a sewer to know that filth is in it: stand on the bank above the sewage disposal and smell the stuff as it blobs out. ("Blobs": koine Greek for "spews.")

Bob Jones Sr. (1882-1968) used to say something like that. You do not have to go to college or even high school to spot a real "scholar." If he is the real thing he will have gone to all kinds of trouble to gather (see Prov. 18:1-2) all the material he can from the ends of the earth (Prov. 17:24) to prove his point, and he will *document* what he says, showing you *who* said it (or wrote it), *when* they did it, and on *what basis* they did it. I am not a scholar of any sorts and have never professed to be. Years ago (1989) we had a nut out in "the land of fruits and nuts" whom we dubbed "Hot Dog" Hymers. Hymers was a dead-orthodox apostate who was ambitious to climb up the BBF ladder after leaving the SBC. He decided the best way to put himself on the map was to "go to bats" for the apostate Fundamentalists in the Scholar's Union who needed to be rescued from a junkyard dog who was biting the seat out of their britches at pretty regular intervals (see *The Last Grenade*, 1990, pp. 240-340). When Hymers was put on the spot for \$1,000—which he had offered to anyone who could prove that anyone believed "what Ruckman believed" before 1960—he chickened out by saying "any scholar." Upon committing that terrible error—and the poor kid hasn't realized yet (1992) what an error it was!—he said, "so poor old Ruckman is standing out *there* all alone by himself." This was a confession that

"Ruckman" was a scholar. Hymers made the profession, *I didn't*. I am "standing out here all by myself" with Bob Gray, George Grace, Dick Cimino, Lester Roloff, Don and Tim Green, Roland Rasmussen, Rick DeMichele, John Mitchell, Maze Jackson, Jack Hyles, Oliver Green, Bruce Cummons, Sam Gipp, Victor Sears, Brad Weniger, Bobby Ellis, John Bunyon, Bobby Ware, and all of the converts of Dwight Moody, Billy Sunday, Sam Jones, Bob Jones Sr., Gen. William Booth, J. Frank Norris, DeWitt Talmage, Charles Spurgeon, and ninety-five percent of the members of the ten largest Baptist churches in America (1970-1985). You see, Hymers meant Ruckman is *the only "scholar"* who believes what he believes. Bad mistake, Ruckman never professed to be a "scholar," and before this Manifesto is over you will know why.

The plethora ("Yeah man! deah am one ob dem words!") of "scholars" has been greatly increased by the "do-it-yourself," junk food program for would-be "scholars." This contains nifty little things like "minute rice" and "minute lasagna" and "minute pizza." Anyone and everyone can be a "scholar." All you have to have is shekels (\$\$\$). From 1960 on, one will find the most amazing network of correspondence schools (and some "residence") where anyone can get a "Doctorate" in less than two years.

"Earn your *degree!* Associate through *Doctorate!*" On Campus or Home Study (Lael University and Counselling Center); "Degrees offered, *Doctorate* and Associates," Resident and Extension (Kingsway Christian College); "Faculty directed home study" full accredited, over twenty degree programs through *Doctorate* (International Bible College and Seminary); "You can now complete your *Ph.D. Degree* through our directed individual study program in the comfort of your home or office," "credit given for *life experience*" (Baptist Christian University); "You can earn the B.A. through *Doctorate*"; Trinity provides innovative off-campus training (Trinity College and Seminary); "Study off campus and become a *seminary graduate*," Doctor of Religious Education, *Doctor of Sacred Theology*, *Doctor of Ministry* (Bethany Bible College), etc.

Incubator "Doctors" produced en masse.

In keeping with this, along comes two hundred Fundamentalist celebrities awarding each other "Doctorates" because all of them want to be recognized scholars, and none of them were even "intellectuals." Thus at a "Sword Conference" you will find so many "Doctors" you will think that God must have come down with the flu. There are nothing but "Doctors" on the platform and ninety percent of them couldn't hold a Hebrew Bible right side up or tell you the difference between Syp and Syh in a footnote in Nestle's. All the hillbillies were aspiring to be "scholars" so folks could brag about their "scholarship." (God made me stay in seminary four years after I wanted to quit and get out into the ministry; otherwise, I wouldn't have any "Doctor's Degree." I grant a B.D. to my students here who take the full course (which includes three years of Greek and a year of Hebrew, plus Manuscript Evidence, "Problem Texts," and "Advanced Theology") and I grant a Th.M. to those that go a year beyond and turn in a research paper plus a "thesis." Since I am their teacher this entitles me to five earned degrees: B.A., M.A., Th.M., B.D., and Ph.D.

"Some men die by degrees" (God deliver me from DEATH!)

CHAPTER THREE

The Mind Set of the Great Scholars

America has three "gods": Money, Sex, and Education. These three "industries" outstrip General Motors, U S. Steel, and Exxon when it comes to "worship." The first god controls the liquor traffic, the dope and drug traffic, monopolies, corrupt business practices, inflation, depressions, and taxes. The second one explains the pornographic industry, the corruption of the public school system, child molesting, the abortion industry, sex perversion, rock music, and GRID (now called "AIDS"). The third "god" takes care of corrupt Bible translations and revisions, tuition payments, apostasy in Christian colleges and universities, jungle lifestyles, racial strife, and rejection of absolute authority. Every American wants his child to have a "college education." For what reason I have never figured out. *I have had THREE of them.* Outside of learning a trade (how to be a lawyer, accountant, engineer, doctor, dentist, etc.), I have no idea what a college education is for except to get into your billfold or bank account. A Trade School would be worth twice the money any college education would be worth unless you knew what you intended to study when you got there and took only the courses essential for learning that particular "trade." A "Liberal Arts" education to get a "degree" is quite similar to throwing a bushel basket full of \$20 bills off the fantail of a Destroyer. Nonetheless, the educators who make a living promoting their own trade (\$\$\$) keep it before the public eye: "Get all the education you can." Why? Why, unless it simply means that you can make a better living? A crane operator on a "high riser" makes \$45 an hour (1985). A "union member" on Eastern Airlines makes anywhere from eight to eighteen dollars an hour (1987) and three American professional enter-

tainers, who never went to college ANYWHERE, made an average of eight million dollars a year. I've had ten years of education above the high school level in three universities and I have never seen more than twenty thousand dollars at one time in my lifetime, and that was *gone* within a week after I got it. I make about what an electrician or a plumber down South would make in a year; except I paid over sixty thousand dollars to "learn my trade." Earning a degree from ANY college or university cannot:

1. Give you any brains or common sense.
2. Show you how to get along with people or handle people.
3. Enable you to get a job unless you have "contacts."
4. Make you happy or keep you sane.
5. Prepare you for death or judgment
6. Guarantee a successful career in any line.
7. Keep you from becoming a chronic alcoholic, embezzler, jail bird, drug addict, or a suicide.

The second major cause of death among college students (after car wrecks) is *suicide*, and the highest rate of suicides for any profession is among college educated *psychiatrists*. (See *Science and Philosophy*, op cit, pp 339-353). "The bigger the belfry, the more room for the bats."

Still, the myth persists; "High academic standards," "Getting equipped to face life," "Our graduates are successful," "Enter to learn, go forth to serve," "It is a terrible thing to waste a mind," "Our graduates are serving Christ worldwide," etc., etc. (\$\$\$) Granted that a doctor, lawyer, or dentist can "clean up" financially, and a College education is necessary for stealing that kind of money, and granted that God might actually call some men into those wealthy professions, what would that have to do with this:

"They that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts."

"Beware of covetousness which is idolatry."

"A man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth."

"Charge them that are rich in this world, that

they be not highminded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God."

"For in vain man would be wise, though man be born like a wild ass's colt."

You see, it wasn't just the unsaved evolutionists in the nineteenth and twentieth century who refused to place a College education alongside the "standard." It was the founders, staffs, faculty members, alumni, and trustees of *Christian* colleges and universities who laid the standard aside in their thinking. Try this:

"He taketh the wise in their own craftiness."

"The wisdom of this world is foolishness with God."

"If any man among you seemeth to be wise in this world, let him become a fool, that he may be wise...we are fools for Christ's sake."

"It pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe...not with enticing words of man's wisdom."

"God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise;...for the wisdom of their wise men shall perish,...that which is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God."

Do you know how a "brilliant Christian scholar" will handle every one of those passages? He will get rid of every one of them (just like the Fundamentalists and Conservatives got rid of 2 Tim. 2:15 and 1 Tim. 6:5, 9, 10 in the *NKJV*) by historicizing them into oblivion, or by "contexting" them out of application, or by going to the "original" to prove that the verses are not truths which God gave him and intended for him to believe.

For example, suppose I was a "good, godly, recognized, qualified, reverent Biblicist" whose "militant stand for the fundamentals" and "loyalty to the word of God" was "unquestioned." What would I do with *these* verses?

Simple: *I would "context" them out of existence.* I would claim that "Paul, here, is NOT referring to saved scholars at all. His remarks are limited to unsaved, Christ-rejecting philosophers. Everything he said is to be applied to LOST Greeks who rejected Christ because they thought the Gospel was "foolishness." It is wrong to apply these—like that heretic "Ruckman" does to "good, godly, recognized, qualified, militant Fundamentalists" just because they also use enticing words of man's wisdom, and DO highly esteem what unsaved scholars highly esteem, and DO NOT become fools for Christ's sake and are often "crafty."

Now go back and read the verses. Now ask God this time instead of some educated blank like Lewis Foster, William S LaSor, Herbert Ehrenstein, J. R. Michaels, Robert Mounce, John Skilton, Gerald Studer, or Gerald Hawthorne—if what Paul said is not applicable to every wise man on this earth who thinks he is WISE and turns up his nose at people he thinks are "fools" while following the things that worldly wise men "*highly esteem.*"

If the references can only be applied to the Gospel Plan of Salvation vs. the Greek Philosopher's Plan of Salvation, then why are they reinforced by this:

"Mind not high things, but condescend to men of low estate."

"Seest thou a man wise in his own conceit? there is more hope of a fool than of him."

"If any man teach otherwise,...He is proud, knowing nothing."

"I would not, brethren,...that ye should be wise in your own conceits."

"Great men are not always wise:...they die even without wisdom."

"Behold, the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom...for the Lord giveth wisdom."

"With the lowly is wisdom. A scorner seeketh wisdom, and findeth it not."

“But the eyes of a fool are in the ends of the earth.”

There isn't one reference listed that has to do with “fools” and “foolishness” (or “wise” or “wisdom”) in any context of *preaching the gospel*. Two of them are direct warnings to Christians who have already believed the “preaching of the cross,” and another one could be applied to them for all three are in the Pauline Epistles, written to people who were *already saved*. Any man who is **“wise in his own conceit”** is a fool and the “preaching of the cross” or “God's Plan of Salvation” has **NOTHING TO DO WITH IT**. No scerner can find wisdom, whether he is saved or lost, and the “preaching of the cross” is not even a factor in it. A Christian “fool” whose eyes are **“in the ends of the earth,”** is just as big a fool as an unsaved Greek philosopher whose eyes are **“in the ends of the earth.”**

Do you see what the “good, godly, dedicated, militant Fundamentalist Biblical scholar” did? He *protected his trade* (\$\$\$) by lying to you. He took advantage of the fact that you would not **“search the scriptures”** to see what the scriptures said about the scriptures. He trusted you would take what *he said* about the scriptures to be “scriptural.” This is the Alexandrian Cult (1991). It was the same in 200 A.D. (Pantaenus, Clement, Origen, Philo, Augustine, Eusebius, et al.). Christian “scholarship” is usually just as corrupt as the scholarship of Karl Marx and Sigmund Freud (and neither one of them were scholars), or the scholarship of Julius Wellhausen (1844-1918) and Karl Graf (1815-1869). Where there is no absolute authority, you exercise *your own authority and get rid of every verse in the Book that points out your sins*. “Godly Christian scholars” react to the exposure of their sins exactly the way that unsaved drunks and sex perverts react to exposure of their sins. Ezekiel 14 and John 3:17-20 describe this operation quite clearly; it is also described in John 12:42, 43 and Genesis 3:7, 8.

The word “scholar” occurs two times in the scriptures (1 Chron. 25:8 and Mai. 2:12). Observe, in the first reference, that the “scholar” is not a teacher *he is a student*. This is also true the second time the word is used, for the word is put in apposition to “master.” This alone should tell you something

about higher Christian education in America, for they have used the Biblical term—defined in the scriptures by the scriptures—in a different sense than God intended for it to be used. Modern, higher Christian education doesn't call ANY man a "scholar" unless he has been teaching or writing for at least five years; normally somewhere around twenty years. The famous "erudite scholarship" of "godly scholars" is a reference to the written destructive criticisms of your Holy Bible published by *professional teachers*. Something is rotten at the core. The core is Genesis 3:1 (see *The Damnation of a Nation*, Chap. 1, 1991).

There are no "Christian" schools in the New Testament. New Testament Christians are evidently "anti-intellectual." "Men of high degree are a lie" in the Old Testament (Psa. 62:9). They use their learning to get around doing what God told them to do (see Isa. 29:11). To do this, they feign "agnosticism" (see the classic case in Matt. 21:26). The Bible is much more scientific in dealing with such matters than someone like Freud, Pavlov, Jung, Menninger, Adler, Fluegl, Klein, Wundt, Angell, Kohler, or Froom. Agnosticism is a psychiatric device for "escapism." "The only thing I know for certain is that I know nothing for certain."

"Are you *sure* of that?"

"Absolutely CERTAIN!"

Dr. Edward Hills (*Believing Bible Study*) has some scintillating comments to make about this type of "intellect" that insists there are no absolutes but only "probabilities" which are "probably probable."

There is a man (I forget his name) who translates and interprets for the United Nations. I believe he speaks, reads, and writes forty different languages fluently. There is a man somewhere who can multiply four digit numbers in his head in less than ten seconds after you give him the two numbers (say 4872 times 7093). Gerhard Dirks (a saved German) has an IQ of 208 and holds one hundred-forty patents on IBM, including rotatable magnetic storages, drum files, addressing cyclic storages, vernier clock generating means, two tape sorting, selective data transfer, inverse track recording, serial decimal adders, and text correcting perforators. Dirks got saved

messing with computers while a saved German (Fritz Waldheim) "put it to him." Fritz accused him of having a closed mind and hiding behind agnosticism (p. 180, *The Dirks Escape*, C. Brandon Rimmer, 1978), as Adam hid in Genesis 3:8.

The "light" broke on Dirks when he was trying to construct a human brain. What finished him was the "power of negative thinking." "God stored the data about Gerhard Dirks in Gerhard Dirks. He was his own file...every man carries his own data." When he examined himself (Psa. 77:6; Ecc. 1:13, 7:25; Heb. 4:12-13) he didn't like what he found. Dirks said, "No, this is not fair. I am looking only at things that are WRONG; things are out of proportion." Then he recalled that when a computer program is written it is put into the computer, and the programmer looks for *errors*. The scientific, objective, mathematical, and correct approach is *negativism*. (This is called "de-bugging" in computer programming.) He suddenly said aloud to himself, "When I put my program into a computer, I am not interested in what is RIGHT; that I ignore. What I want to know from the machine is 'what is wrong.' Why do you think God is any different?"

He isn't. He wasn't. He won't be. The Book knows all about you and tells it, and that is why it has to be "Greekified" and "Hebrewfied" and "historicized" and "contextualized" out of sight (Mark 7:8-13). *It is against man*; it tells him what is wrong with him (Heb. 4:12, 13). Two minutes after the intellect with an IQ of 208 spoke the above words to himself, he was on his knees praying "Lord Jesus Christ, have mercy on me and wash me in your blood!" (op cit., p. 184).

What a remarkable posture for a man holding a Doctorate of Law (University of Leipzig) who had been "Liner Controller" for Skoda factories in Prague; Staff Controller at Waffen-Union Corporation; Manager of the Organization-Department for Mercedes-Bueromaschinen Corp.; and Assistant to the General Manager of Papierfabriken Muldenstein Mills!

Gerhard Dirks will never be able to get into the Scholar's Union. He committed an un scholarly "sin unto death" when he believed that *shed blood* was necessary for a man to claim before he could face God *after death* and give account for his sins.

That is a "no-no" for all "brilliant intellectuals." Brilliant intellectuals do not believe in primitive religions that require *bloody sacrifices*; any brilliant intellect knows better than that. Any intellect but Gerhard Dirks, IQ 208; *58 above genius*.

Now let's turn the coin over. Here are a whole parade of "brilliant intellectuals" beginning with Aristotle (384-322 B.C.) and ending with Stephen Hawking (*A Brief History of Time*, Bantam Books, 1988). Here is 2372 years of "scientific advancement" by the most blazing and brilliant intellects that ever rejected both Testaments of the Holy Bible. Here is "man" at his best and highest; at the very peak of intellectual brilliancy. Here is man—"the measure of all things"—boldly assuming and declaring that God never said anything or revealed anything to man in the way of *verbal communications*; notwithstanding "man" will figure out the "mind of God" by *theorizing* and making chemical and atomic *experiments*.

First, Aristotle (384-322 B.C.) is given credit for theorizing the earth was a round sphere (p. 2) after Isaiah called it a "circle" (Isa. 40:22) in 580 B.C. and Christ spoke about day and night being at the same time on the earth (Luke 17:31, 34). Then there is Ptolemy and then Copernicus (1473-1543), and then Galileo (1564-1642); who was assumed to have made a fool out of Moses, because he made a fool out of the Catholic church. Then there was Kepler and Isaac Newton (1642-1727)—who invented a word (gravity) to account for what he couldn't explain—and no one has explained it since. Then Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), who theorized one thing (the nebular hypothesis) that no one could prove; then Heinrich Obler who made some more bum guesses which didn't prove anything. [Unlike a colored preacher in Macon, Georgia, back in the 1950's, no man in the group (including the Roman Catholic Augustine) could answer the question "What did God do *before* He created the Universe?" Hawking takes a slap at the Holy Spirit and says that Augustine couldn't reply because he thought God was making a Hell for people who asked such questions. God was "*in His glory*" before Genesis 1:1. He told you that in John 17:24, but intellectuals have always encountered insuperable problems when they pick up an English Bible. That

Negro preacher in Macon, Georgia (without a High School education) knew the answer to *that* one. "If you ain't got no edjcation, you jes has to use yo brains!"]

We are now (1990) told that no scientific theory is foolproof; not even if odds of twenty thousand to one are certain (p. 10), so no one can determine their actions or anyone's future actions, but a good rule to go by is "Darwin's (!) principle of natural selection." (Darwin was proved to be a hoax between 1860-1880 by an Austrian monk (Gregor Mendel). Natural selection and "acquired characteristics" are as *non-scientific* as "vestigial organs" and "ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny.") Our ideas of time and space are supposed to have been "revolutionized" (p. 20) by Einstein's theory of relativity so that now we can...can what? Nothing. Space is not absolute; time is not absolute, speed is not absolute, truth is not absolute, and *science* is not absolute: neither is the *theory of relativity*. Yet now we "know" that light is particles as well as waves—by the division in infinity; thus atoms, then dust particles, then electrons around a neutron, then protons, but then "quarks." Some intellectual got a Nobel Prize (1969) for saying that protons and neutrons were composed of "quarks" (p. 65). All of these particles "spin." Any light yet? Well, the "electron" turned out to have an anti-electron (Paul Dirac, 1932) or "positron" (you substitute the positive "pro" suffix for the negative "anti" so you can line up with the NEA, the news media, and Norman Vincent Peale.) You *invent* words to explain what you can't explain. But here are "anti-quarks" for the quarks, so you can see how much this has "revolutionized" our ideas. When a quark joins an anti-quark (p. 73) it becomes a "meson." The trouble is that a "gluon" spins mesons around so that a collection of gluons becomes a "glueball" (p. 73).

[You are to be taking this seriously. No laughing or smirking, please! These nuts are Nobel Prize winners we are talking about, here. You don't have to agree with them, but you must admit that this "advanced light" on the nature of time and space sure has helped solve man's problems: sickness, death, taxes, war, poverty, disease, sex perversion, crime, earthquakes, tidal waves, cyclones, volcanoes, religious disunity, economic col-

lapses, sin, death, and hell. "Awesome," baby! Awesome!]

Frankly, I think that the smallest particle is a MITE and the things that rotate around it are TWINKIES and ANTI-TWINKIES. The twinkies are composed of itsy bitsy particles called "spookies" and the anti-spookies are sometimes referred to as "flookies." When the "spin" of the flookies is disrupted by "gookies" a FLUKE BALL is formed. (I got the No-Belly Peace Prize for that when I put it in a Stein containing Metrecal.)

Isn't it amazing the lengths to which a poor, ignorant, self-righteous sinner will go to get *GOD* out of His creation (Rom. 1:18-21)?

I have always liked *Pogo*, *Krazy Kat*, and *Calvin and Hobbes* (the latter in particular). It has also occurred to me on many occasions, since I was saved, that *Crock*, *The Wizard of Id*, *The Far Side*, and *B.C.* contain profound philosophical and scientific truths, at least if you believe the *Bible*, and I do believe the Bible. I have the Bible. *I read it.* (I never mean "the Word of God" when I say "BIBLE." I never mean "the original autographs" when I say "the Bible." When I say "the Bible"—unlike the students, graduates, and faculty members of the twenty largest Fundamental and Conservative colleges, universities, and seminaries in America—I mean "*THE BIBLE.*" I have a copy of the Bible.) I got my first copy in 1949, and I've had one "on me" ever since.

At any rate, I saw a comic strip once—I think it was called *Sam and Siloh* (or something like that) where a small town (pop. 1,000) sheriff's deputy is sitting in an open car in early spring trying to convince himself that it is not cold. He must stay parked by the highway to catch "speeders." He is shivering and saying, "It's all in your MIND. It's all in your mind. You are not really cold. It's just in your mind." In the second panel snow flakes begin to fall. In the third panel he is hugging himself and beating himself with his hands and saying, "Mind over matter. *Mind over matter.* It's just in your mind." By the fifth panel, there is ice on the windshield and an icicle forming on his nose and he is hollering "Mind over matter! I'm not cold. *Mind over matter.*" In the last panel he is staring blankly into a blizzard

broken down "fishing smack" in the surf with HALF the intelligence of any professional gambler in Las Vegas or Atlantic City. These "scholars" are the men who are looked up to for their "scholarship." They are considered to be "intellectuals." They are as *anti-intellectual* and as *irrational*, and as *non-objective*, and as *biased* as a Jesuit priest in 1500 writing about Lollards, Manicheans, Cathari, and "Berengarians."

The dry dock *foundation* that every man in the list built his seagoing craft in was the basic, bedrock, foundational THEORY that life occurred *accidentally* on this planet with the odds against it being one out of 13,000 (add 1,240 more zeroes and you'll have it). And every man in the fleet professed to believe in *mathematics*: the mathematics of *Albert Einstein*.

You are not only to believe these looney birds are SANE; you are to believe that they are "scholarly." Why? Because they invented terminology for the theories in their trade which you don't understand, so when they wanted to sell you a bill of goods (\$\$\$) they snowed you under with high sounding words (see Jude 16, and 2 Pet. 2:18). It is the "dumb ass" (2 Pet. 2:16) who was ordained to straighten these ding-a-lings out, according to the New Testament.

"Play it again, Sam!"

The Origin of Consciousness in the Breakdown of the Bicameral Mind (Julian Jaynes, Houghton-Mifflin, Boston, 1976). Here we have 446 pages of sheer madness that would give Karl Menninger (1898-1990) enough food for thought to work on for a lifetime [or Alfred Adler (1870-1937), Karl Jung (1875-1961), Franz Mesmer (1734-1815), James Braid (1795-1860), Jean Charcot (1825-1893), Emil Kraepelin (1865-1926), Otto Rank, Erich Fromm, Karen Horney, and Melanie Klein]. What is in Jayne's work? Well, what would you think would be in it since he began with the same basic premise every monkey man listed so far began with? You came from nowhere, *accidentally*, you are headed nowhere, *accidentally*. You may, or may not, "make it," *accidentally*, but no one knows where "there" is, or *what* is there. ("Heil Agnosticism!

All hail the power of Higher Education's name! Let Bible believers prostrate fall Bring forth the royal diadem and crown PROSIMIANS Lord of All!') Is Jayne's work a "scholarly" work? Honey, you can bet your quarks and mesons it is. Here we find G. H. Lewis' *The Physical Basis of Mind* (Trubner, 1877) H. S. Jennings' *Behaviour of the Lower Organisms* (McMillan Co., 1906), R. A. Hinde's *Animal Behaviour* (McGraw Hill, 1970), Darwin's *Descent of Man*, William James' *Principles of Psychology* (Holt Co., 1890), William McDougall's *Body and Mind* (London, Methuen, 1911) and *Modern Materialism and Emergent Evolution* (Van Nostrand, 1929), H. W. Magoun's *The Waking Brain* (Thomas, 1958), W. B. Carpenter's *Human Physiology and Principles of Mental Physiology* (1852 and 1874), Robert Woodworth's *Psychological Issues* (Columbia University Press, 1939), and Max Muller's *The Science of Thought* (Longmans Green, 1887).

And just so you wouldn't think that Jaynes was not a "scholar" here are citations from *The Journal of Experimental Psychology*, *The American Journal of Psychology*, *The Journal of General Psychology*, *The Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, *The Journal of Neurology Nuerosurgical Psychiatry*, *The Journal of Neurosurgery*, *The Journal of Cuneiform Studies*, *The Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, and *The Journal of Historical Studies*

"Hey bob-a-rebop!" (American, circa 1940) You talk about "blazing intellects!" You talk about "erudite scholarship." You talk about "doing your homework!" What combination of teachers at Liberty Baptist University, Pensacola Christian College, Tennessee Temple, Bob Jones University, or Baptist Bible College could turn out a research "paper" like that!?

What is the thesis of "*The Origin of Consciousness in the Breakdown of the Bicameral Mind?*"

The thesis is that since the human brain is composed of "Wernicke's area" and "Broca's area" with a "supplementary motor area" and an "anterior commissure" and a "hallucinatory area" (pp. 101, 104) that it is a "DOUBLE BRAIN."

This double brain invents religions and gods in its "right hemisphere" (pp. 104-107) since it acts independently of the "left hemisphere" (p. 112). The "right hemisphere" looks at "wholes" while the left hemisphere looks at "parts"

Do you want to waste another hour? Let's get to the point. Every man is schizo; two individuals. He attributes "godhood" first to his human rulers, then he attributes divinity to *statues* or *idols* of his rulers, and then, through the centuries, he develops religious systems around these divinities. The whole operation is *hallucinatory*, coming from a physical object (the brain) which came into being accidentally from nowhere, for no purpose. Thus, John and Paul ascribe deity to an ordinary man (Jesus Christ), the Catholic church builds it into a system, and then modern science destroys the system so man is now adrift (see the garbage scows mentioned above) with no authoritative guide. You can say one thing for Jaynes' schizoid "double brain" He grasps the fact that science itself and scientists (in 1990) are just as "sea worthy," and just as adrift as the Catholic popes and bishops. They have no *final authority* either. Jaynes' conclusion brings you to the point where you will accept *Satan* as the final authority when he shows up (2 Thess. 2, Rev. 13, Dan. 11, etc.). His last chapter (*The Auguries of Science*) says that the issue is "authorization" and the "search for authorization," because the scriptures have lost their "authority" (p. 437). We must recover the "lost authorization" of *NATURE* (p. 437).

You understand, this is the result of decades of intensive research and collation on a graduate level: this time, a graduate level dealing with *the source of the intellect's intelligence*: the **BRAIN**. It means that if you are pro-intellectual you are just as nutty as a pecan pie. Any Bible believer with an eighth-grade education has a higher "authority" than nature or science, *or their own brain*. Any Bible believer with a sixth-grade education has an authorization from an *Authorized Version*, that can correct any theory invented or discussed in the last twenty pages. Any Bible believer, anywhere on the face of this earth has, at hand, an authority higher than any pope who ever lived, or any conclave of bishops or archbishops who ever assembled

anywhere. This authority has proved to be authoritative and the product of Divinity by the computerized mathematics of Reichenbach and Heisenberg—neither of whom believed in God, Christ, the Bible, Heaven, Hell, or the New Birth (see *The Christian's Handbook of Science and Philosophy*, pp. 201-231, 1985).

The "Bicameral Mind" didn't enter these mathematical statistics *one time*. What Jaynes' wrote on was "The Breakdown of the Scholarly Psychologist's Mind."

All the clowns are not in the circus.

Here is a non-existent, non-seen, non-photographed "black hole" (John Wheeler, 1969) which is supposed to be a "collapsed star" (John Mitchell, 1973); or a collapsed Twinky. The theory is that gravity continues to exert force inside a star after all the energy in a star *has burned out*. This far-fetched, "off the wall" conjecture was made to prove that the Universe was eternal; for if one could prove that a star collapsed and then exploded and then collapsed and then exploded—with no reason for doing so but "gravity"—then the Universe could be infinitely collapsing and exploding, giving you a giant accordian operating on *perpetual motion* in absolute defiance of all the demonstrable laws of physics. After wasting your time with the absolutely profitless and vain guesses and formulas of Brandon Carter, George Gamow, Ralph Alpher, Alan Guth, Roger Penrose, and Max Born (pp. 100-141), Hawking finally gives you his "revolutionary" discovery that came about through these "vast labors" (the best brains in the country).

1. Life got here accidentally with the odds against it showing up being about one out of ten to the 1300th power, and the chances of man making it up from a worm being one out of ten to the 229,000th power (pp. 120-121).

2. Your universe is going to collapse after a few hundred million years and then start over again—with no reason for doing so (pp. 144-169).

3. Man is not accountable to any Creator for his thoughts, words, or actions. There is no physical resurrection for anyone; and Christ is still dead in Palestine.

4. The ultimate triumph of human reason will be to "know

the mind of God" (p. 175) in the sense of formulating a complete and perfect "unified quantum theory." (One is reminded of that poor, stupid German Jew who said before he died that he could not believe in any God who was not a mathematical formula," Einstein. "The bigger the belfry, the more room for the bats.")

5. No Heaven, Hell, judgment, morals, ethical standards, purpose for living, restoration of Israel, reign of Christ, Man of Sin, Son of Perdition, Marriage of the Lamb, New Jerusalem, goal in life, conformation to a perfect sinless man, and no enjoying the presence of God, NOW or LATER.

6. No knowledge of God, knowledge of the Bible, assurance of salvation, ability to predict anything, and not one thing said by *anyone* in 175 pages of abstract fairy tales that would help you or me (or anyone else) *live a better life or die a better death.*

That is the result of wanting to be an intellectual or a "recognized scholar."

"Without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep."

"Seest thou a man wise in his own conceit? there is more hope for a fool than of him."

"Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools."

"If any man...consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ,...He is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words."

"Shew the things that are to come hereafter, that we may know that ye are gods: yea, do good, or do evil, that we may be dismayed,...Behold, ye are of nothing, and your work of nought: an abomination is he that chooseth you."

Hawking doesn't know where those words are found; neither did Hubble, Hoyle, Laplace, Albert Einstein, Max Born,

John Schwarz, Joel Scherk, Mick Green, Planck, or any of their friends or associates. There is something about "scholarship" that creates an isolated mentality and makes a dummy out of an egotist.

One sees in every line of a modern physicist's theories a single train of thought. There is nothing really original about any theory any physicist has concocted since 400 B.C. All are one track minds and all operate identically the same. Everyone of them is dead-set on offering some *human explanation* (any explanation) for something supernatural so that the supernatural can be permanently eradicated from the human mind. Romans 1:18-26 psychoanalyzed the spiritual sickness of physicists long before Newton's great great grandfather was born. The trick is to *get rid of God*. That is the Biblical explanation for the total brain output of Aristotle, Laplace, Kant, Born, Hubble, Hoyle, Hawking, Einstein, Heisenberg, Fischer, Miller, Oparin, Frenkel, Panzias, Friedmann, Dopler, and Dieke. All begin with the conviction that Genesis 1-3 is a lie. All begin with the theory that Darwin was sane. All begin with the belief that Jesus Christ was a liar (Mark 13:9, John 5:45-47, Matt. 19:4), and all begin with the theory that everything can eventually be explained and solved by man apart from supernatural revelation.

There really isn't one "original thinker" in the lot. For eight hundred years (1000 A.D. to 1800 A.D.) they looked upward (Astronomy) trying to get rid of God, but after being confronted everywhere with *order* and *design*, they went back to digging around in the ground (Archaeology: 1800-1940) trying to get rid of God (Paley, Lyell, "Strata" Smith, et al.). After running into one dead end after another (Orogenesis unexplained, polystrata fossils unexplained, pre-Cambrian life unexplained, ossiferous fissures unexplained, production of snowflakes and sand beaches unexplained, fossils from 1000 B.C. in the same strata with fossils dated at 100,000 B.C. unexplained, dinosaur tracks and man's tracks in the same strata unexplained, and mathematical statistics denied—say, for example, what happened to a population that should have been 900,000,000,000,000,000 by the time of Christopher Columbus, etc.) they returned to a Catholic monk's position (Gregor

Mendel, 1822-1884), and began to dig into proteins and genes (Biochemistry) and ribosomes and cytoplasm and polypeptide chains, so they could apply the microcosm (atomic structures on earth in chemicals) to the macrocosm (outer space) and get rid of God that way. That is what they did (1940-1990). But, as far as that goes, that is all these non-original, anti-intellectual screwballs have been doing since Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle tried to replace Moses and Solomon.

The "brilliant intellectuals" turn out to be *cloned dummies*; "by their fruits ye shall know them." So, the fruits of this uniform, cloned, anti-intellectual attempt to get rid of God are what you find in the twentieth century. No intellectual in this century could really get upset about the Catholic church killing five million people in the Dark Ages. With the help of Laplace, Kant, Vone Linne (1707-1778), Huyd (1660-1709), Le Maitre (1950), Gamow (1980), Bateson, DeVries, Goldschmidt, Driesch, Bergson, Einstein, Simpson, Peter Medewar, Brough, and Schindewolf—a pack of brilliant intellectuals if you ever saw one, buster!—the *Violent Century* (Ballantine Books) was quite capable of getting rid of seventy million people by VIOLENCE (i.e. "survival of the fittest," "natural selection," "values" instead of morals, "lifestyles" instead of the Ten Commandments, etc.) in two World Wars and forty-five more local wars, plus the bloody purges of Stalin (an evolutionist), Mao Tse-tung (an evolutionist), Hitler (an evolutionist), Idi Amin (an evolutionist), Fidel Castro (an evolutionist), and popes Pius XI, Pius XII, John XXIII, Paul VI, and John Paul II (all theistic evolutionists).

There are *three* world wars "on deck."

Not one man whose name appeared on the last thirty pages (with the exception of Gerhard Dirks, Fritz Waldheim and the Biblical characters) *could predict one of them*. Brilliant intellectuals are "discards" when it comes to *prediction* and *prophecy*. There is a scientific reason for this and it is not a "theory" or an "hypothesis." It has been in print for more than four hundred years and it was written more than 2600 years ago. Would you care to read it?

"Have ye not known?" (No, they haven't!) "Have ye

not heard? hath it not been told to you from the beginning?" (No, they heard nothing, they saw nothing, and nobody told the blockheads anything.) **"Who hath wrought and done it, calling the generations from the beginning? I the Lord, the first and with the last; I am he."** ("No, no! My god no! There cannot be any PERSON present in the Universe who claims to speak to man *directly*. No, not that! Oh my sacred black holes and big bangs, not that!")

"Let them bring them forth, and shew us what shall happen: let them shew the former things, what they be, that we may consider them, and know the latter end of them; or declare us things for to come." (Oh my sacred polypeptide chains, not that! Not predicting an effect based on a past cause. Oh my great crunch and big leap, not that!) **"For I beheld, and there was no man; even among them,...that, when I asked of them, could answer a word."** (What? Not one man? Not one "brilliant intellectual" whose scholarship was "unquestioned"? What, not one scholar from Noah to Einstein who could answer one word?" That is what it said.) **"Behold, the former things are come to pass, and new things do I declare: before they spring forth I tell you of them."** (Then Isaiah would be more *scientific* than the men listed in this chapter. They cannot predict *anything* with certainty and they claim that this agnosticism is a scientific fact that can be proved "mathematically.") **"Let the people be assembled."** (Whoever is speaking is not worrying about any mental or intellectual competition from any scholarly herd.) **"Let all the nations be gathered together,...who among them can declare this, and shew us former things?...before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after me. I even I, am the Lord; and beside me there is no saviour!"** (No, no. Oh my sacred quarks and tribolites, not that! Not a living God who claims absolute final authority. Anything but THAT!) **"Yea, before the day was I am he;...I will work, and who shall let it?...I am the first, and I am the last; and beside me there is no God...Is there a God beside me? Yea, there is no God; I know not any!"** (Goodnight! God is an atheist.) **"Yea, there is no God; I know not any!"**

Are you beginning to see the root of the problem? The root is a *Book*. This Book is the cause for all the "scientific investigations" and it is the instigator of all "scientific progress" and "advancement." The trick is to rid humanity of its absolute truths and final authority (see Chapter 5, *The Damnation of a Nation*, 1991). The basic stimulus for all scientific advancement is *emotional panic*. This explains why two theories of evolution cannot be taught in the public schools in 1990. it would aggravate an *emotional panic* and turn it into a hysterical stampede. The "brilliant intellectuals" are evidently not intellectual at all (see the definitions given on page 2). They are *psychotic children* controlled by *guilt complexes and emotions*.

"I am the Lord that maketh all things: that stretcheth forth the heavens alone; that spreadeth abroad the earth by myself." ("It's a lie! It's a lie. Don't believe it! *Nature* did it, *evolution* did it, *big bangs* did it, *nebular hypotheses* did it, *cooling off* did it, *chemical reactions* did it, *atomic fission* did it, *accident* did it, etc.") **"That frustrateth the tokens of the liars, and maketh diviners mad; that turneth wise men backward, and maketh their knowledge foolish"** (Einstein, Planck, Laplace, Hawking, Hoyle, Hubble, Aristotle, Dewey, Russell, James, Sarte, Tillich, A. T. Robertson, Kant, Bernard Shaw, Kenneth Wuest, Heisenberg, Jean Dixon, Edgar Cayce, Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, Nixon, Carter, and Johnson, plus Buddha, Mohammed, James Price, Eugene Nida, Nestle, Aland, Metzger, Hort, Bob Jones IV, Darwin, Hegel, Freud, Marx, and the NEA). **"I am the Lord, and there is none else. I form the light, and create darkness."** ("No, no! No, 'light is waves and particles' that come from energy! *God had nothing to do with it*. Get God out of it! Quit bringing God into it!")

"I have made the earth, and created man upon it." (Oh my sacred mesons and gluons! What a terrible Dark Age, pre-Galileo, non-scientific, pre-Darwinian, anti-intellectual, reactionary, mid-Victorian, "world view"! **"I, even my hands, have stretched out the heavens, and all their host I have commanded...I the Lord speak righteousness, I declare things that are right."**

In which case, every major recognized, "qualified" scholar

and "brilliant, scientific intellect" since 1880 was a bald-faced liar and just as *unrighteous* as Hell.

"For thus saith the LORD that created the heavens; God himself that formed the earth and made it; he established it, he created it not in vain, he formed it to be inhabited...Assemble yourselves and come; draw near together...tell ye and bring them near; yea, let them take counsel together, who hath declared this from ancient time? Who hath told it from that time? have not I, the Lord?" (Well "they"—see the lists in this chapter—sure didn't. They didn't even *profess* to be able to declare anything from "ancient times" *before* it happened.) "There is no God and there is none else...I am God and there is none like me, declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, 'My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure:' ...I have even from the beginning declared it to thee; before it came to pass I shewed it thee:...I have shewed thee new things from this time, even hidden things, and thou didst not know them...even before the day when thou heardest them not; lest thou shouldst say 'Behold I knew them.' Yea, thou heardest not; yea, thou knewest not."

They were "agnostic"—Ignoramuses.

As you can see (from the above) Truth from the *King James Bible* always comes over the middle of the plate, waist high. "Truths" from the Scholar's Union come over the plate ankle high, knee high, shoulder high, and a foot over the head, and often miss the plate by two feet on the left side or a foot on the right side. Occasionally, these "relative-truth" fanatics will pitch a screwball somewhere between first base and home plate, or a spit ball over the third base line ten feet left of home plate. I have known pitchers like Huxley, Marx, Freud, and Darwin to pitch a "beanball" out into left field somewhere between shortstop and the second baseman.

There must be two types of "scholars" if we are to take the Pauline Epistles seriously where they deal with the Body of Christ. There are *unsaved* scholars (like the Stoics and Epicureans of Acts 17:18; both groups are evolutionists), and

then there are men like Apollos (Acts 18:24) and Paul himself (Acts 22:3). Both men were "scholars" *before they were saved*, exactly as Moses was a scholar (Acts 7:22) *before he was called to preach* (Exod. 3-5). You'd better think about THAT two or three years, also. Paul says that "all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge" (Col. 2:3) are to be found OUTSIDE of any college, university, or seminary. The "treasures of wisdom and knowledge" (see *Science and Philosophy*, pp 2-10) are to be found in the Lord Jesus Christ. The professional liars' answer to this (see *The Christian's Handbook of Biblical Scholarship*, Chapter 7) is, "Oh, but if the school is a 'Christian' college or a 'Christian' university, or a 'Christian' seminary then the treasures of wisdom and knowledge can be found *there!*" Not necessarily; try Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Berlin, Dartmouth, Cambridge, Oxford, Wheaton, Fuller, Colgate, Xenia, Loyola, Stuttgart, Chicago, Baylor, Halle, Crozier, etc. "Oh, but THOSE are apostate! *We* are militant *Fundamentalists* who believe in absolute, infallible, inspired, verbal plenary lost scraps of paper no one ever saw! *We* couldn't go into apostasy!" The profession of the President of Wheaton College in the 1950's, in regards to the "originals" and the "WORD of God," is the identical profession of the faculties and staffs of *BBC and Bob Jones University in the 1990's*. Apostasy is never a "great leap" or "big bang." It is always slow, gradual, subtle, and pious. (See Darwin, p 7).

What is a "Christian SCHOLAR"?

1. Is it a man who professes to believe what was stated in the Council of Nicea (325 A.D.)?
2. Is it a scholar who professes to believe the "fundamentals" in the creed at BJU—which omits any statement regarding the local church, the security of the believer, baptism by immersion, the Second Coming, or the command to witness and evangelize the lost?
3. Is it a scholar who subscribes to the *New Hampshire Confession of Faith* used by the Southern Baptists?
4. Is it a scholar who obeys the pope and subscribes to the seven "sacraments" of the Mariolators?
5. Is it an Amillennial or Postmillennial linguist who

sprinkles babies and spiritualizes ninety percent of the Old Testament?

6. Is it a scholar who professes to have been "born again" or converted to Christ?

7. Is it a scholar who doesn't know where he is going when he dies, or is it one who does know where he is going when he dies?

What on earth is a "Christian" scholar? Further, what would a "godly," Christian scholar be? If you don't know what a *Christian* scholar is, how would you tell whether or not he was "godly"? Bobby the Third said that two apostate Bible critics on his faculty (back in 1980) were "reverent Bibliocists." What on earth is that? *Were they "scholars"?* If so, were they "Christian" scholars? Neither man referred to had any higher authority than his own opinion or the orders of the man who employed him. Is this "New Testament Scholarship"? And if no one can tell us what a "Christian" scholar is, how in the world could they tell us what a *Biblical* scholar is? Isn't a *Biblical* scholar supposed to be a Christian who believes the "Bible" (Acts 24:14)? Could it really mean ANYONE who critiques or corrects the Bible? Would this not include atheists, Buddhists, agnostics, Satanists, polytheists, and nihilists as well as "Christians"? Someone, for about one hundred years (1880-1990) has been taking advantage of the fact that the crowd mentioned in the previous chapter succeeded in removing the Christian's brains from him so he wouldn't be able to THINK.

Face it: a man who majors in research and collation on a given subject *might* be a scholar (or he might not be) but he would not be a CHRISTIAN scholar unless he was a *saved* man in the Body of Christ (Ephesians-Colossians).

It gets worse; the word "Christian" originally did not mean a "saved sinner" in the Body of Christ. The word *originally* was a reference to a disciple who followed a MAN (Acts 11:26, John 7:48, Acts 24:5) and put that man ahead of his own family (Luke 14:26, Matt. 10:37). Are the "Christian" scholars that Josh McDowell refers to (Walter Erdman, Mark Hatfield, James Hefley, Bernard Ramm, Elton Trueblood, E. M. Blaiklock, F. F. Bruce, Wilbur Smith, Phillip Schaff, Alex-

ander Souter, F. C. Grant, J. Anderson, Kenneth LaTourette, Bruce Metzger, Merrill Unger, G. L. Archer, et al.) "Christian," or just "saved sinners"? *What is a Christian "Biblical" scholar?*

Now get some copies of the *Bible Believer's Commentary on Gal.-Col., Exodus, Job, Acts, and Proverbs* and you will find the scholars we are about to refer to are the standard set of commentators found in every Bible commentary printed since 1700. These names (Tholuck, Salmond, Trench, Vincent, Thayer, Hengstenberg, Delitzsch, Hitzig, Perowne, Harrison, Huxtable, Bengel, Ellicott, Burton, Grotius, Ramsay, Ridderbos, Conybeare, Toy, Hackett, Alford, Lightfoot, Wordsworth, Lipsius, Zockler, DeWette, et al.) form what we call "The Scholar's Union." They have become the "final authority in all matters of correct Biblical exegesis and correct textual reconstruction." The last term means "correct replacement of the Holy Bible (AV, 1611)." These are the "Christian Intellectuals"—the counterparts of the Darwin-Freud-Marx-Einstein monkey men mentioned in the previous chapter. One may include among these scholarly "elite," John Garstang, Charles Pfeiffer, William Albright, Sanford La Sor, Eugene Nida, Tischendorf, Von Soden, B. Weiss, Erwin Nestle, Kurt Aland, Bruce Metzger, Mill, Fell, Brian Walton, Karl Lachmann, Griesbach, Hort, Howard Vos, Joseph Free, Gleason Archer, James Orr, Jamieson, Fausset, Brown, Henry Morris, C. F. Keil, and several others. These are the men that we CORRECT constantly in *The Bible Believer's Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*, *The Bible Believer's Commentary on Genesis*, *The Bible Believer's Commentary on Job*, *The Bible Believer's Commentary on the Psalms* and *The Christian's Handbook of Biblical Scholarship*.

We judge them by one standard, we correct them by one standard, and we discard them wherever (and whenever) they try to get rid of that standard of judgment.

Isn't that the most anti-intellectual, "simplistic" thing you ever heard of in all your life?

Were the great Biblical archaeologists (Bliss, Burkhardt, Wooley, Burrows, Calloway, Cross, Conder, Glueck, Grant,

Hammond, Wright, Petrie, Warren, Sellin, Hull, Inge, Lapp, Horsefield, Fisher and Kyle) just "short-sighted fools"? Who knows? *There wasn't one soul winner in the lot.* Nor is there a soul winner among the other archaeologists (Maspero, Newberry, Legrain, Perring, Montet, Marietta, Steindorf, Grenfell, Hassan, Champollion, Carter, Boussaro, Belzoni, Fisher, and Frankfort). According to John R. Rice (who is called a "scholar" by every member of the Board of *The Sword of the Lord*, and professed himself to be one!), if a Christian is not winning souls he is guilty of:

1. Following Christ afar off (Matt. 4:19).
2. Spiritual manslaughter (Ezek. 3:18-21).
3. The folly of a short-sighted FOOL (Prov. 11:30).

Rice judged every Christian on this earth by six verses found in a *King James Bible*. How could dear old, "godly" John Rice do such a deplorable thing!

How utterly "non-scholarly." How "anti-intellectual!"

"Dear Dr. John: what do you mean by vilifying 'good men' and slandering those 'who don't agree with you'?" (Do you see yet how "the snow drifts"? Do you get the "lay of the land" yet?)

Double standard: *Alexandrian Cult.*

1. One standard *from the pulpit* with the Holy Bible in your hand—the living words of the living God—and *the truth* in your mouth; blasting and scolding backslidden, disobedient Christians who are living like the devil.

2. Another standard *in the Christian university or seminary* where you are "bucking for points" to be recognized as a "qualified scholar," worthy of the Union. Drop the evangelism, ditch the Book, quit telling the truth, and *LIE* your way through (\$\$\$).

Rice did it, Torrey did it, Broadus did it, Spurgeon did it, Bob Jones III always does it, James Combs does it, and so does Bob Jones IV, and every ministerial student in America who was dumb enough to go by No. 2 above instead of No. 1.

Have you ever seen one line of print, anywhere (in any letter or publication in the world) *in the last three hundred years*, that told you how Fenton John Anthony Hort or Brooke Westcott

got saved? Why do you call them "Christian" scholars? You're a little anti-intellectual aren't you, going around establishing positions without any *evidence*? You're slightly "non-scientific" aren't you? Have you ever read Eberhard Nestle's testimony on his conversion? What if he was an unsaved man, operating under Ephesians 2:1-4? You *know* that he wasn't? Where is your evidence? One slip of paper will do just fine. You say, "Well he professed to believe that...." So do all popes, Jesuits, and cardinals. What does this mean? Custer, at Bob Jones University said that his Greek New Testament (Nestle) was verbally inspired and that he would defend every word of it. He would? Would he if he knew that Eberhard Nestle and his son (Erwin) were both LOST? Why didn't he check before he accepted their "scholarship"? Easy; their scholarship was *impressive*. The Nestles were great researchers and collators, therefore...? Therefore what!? Go along with 'em: megabucks, baby (\$\$\$).

You see, the faculty at BJU (as the faculty of any major Fundamentalist or Evangelical "Christian" school) simply laid the Holy Bible aside in order to be connected with the scholarship of two Germans who couldn't give you an account of their conversion experience if their souls depended on it: neither could Westcott or Hort.

Real scholars are as scarce as hen's teeth. The contemporary (and eternal) line of baloney put out by the educators (the intelligensia themselves) is that everyone who agrees that *they* are scholars is "scholarly." Some of the more "militant" of the apostate Fundamentalists (1900-1990) dare make a distinction between "liberal" scholarship and "fundamental" scholarship but not where denial of *absolute authority* is concerned. In this respect, both groups of intelligensia are in perfect agreement; when it comes to absolute truth and final authority, the faculties and staffs of BBC, Bob Jones University, Liberty University, and Pensacola Christian College believe exactly what Bishop Oxnam, Ralph Sockman, Dean Weigle, Dodd, James Pike, Niebhur, Paul Tillich, H. E. Fosdick, Millar Burrows, Eugene Carson Blake, and Norman Vincent Peale believe.

Dean J. W. Burgon (1813-1888) was a scholar. If you picked ten men who were real scholars (say between 400 B.C.

and 1990 A.D.), John William Burgon would have to be one of them. Burgon is the BASE upon which Wilbur Pickering, Zane Hodges, Arthur Farstad, Edward Hills, Sturz, and others erect their "theses." His works (*Causes of Corruption in the Traditional Text*, *The Revision Revised*, *Inspiration and Interpretation*, *The Last Twelve Verses of Mark*, etc.) are "standards" and survive one hundred years of scrutiny and criticism. Burgon's arguments for the genuineness of the traditional "Majority Text" against the Neologian's "Alexandrian Text" are absolutely conclusive and the mass of scholarship behind them (Scrivener's *A Full and Exact Collation of About Twenty Greek Manuscripts of the Holy Gospels*, *An Exact Transcript of the Codex Augiensis*, *A Full Collation of the Codex Sinaiticus*, etc., for example) has never been successfully overthrown to this day. Burgon slapped fifty authorities from anti-Nicene writings on five passages to prove that in the apostolic age the "Byzantine" (traditional) text was known and used. When Edward Miller (1886) closes his book on *A Guide to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, he says "The true guide in all is GOD the Holy Ghost, Who, reverently sought in purity of heart, humility of soul, and wisdom of mind, will in His Own due time, and after His Own perfect counsels, lead the Church and her children to ascertain the sureness, from clear and decisive evidence, the real form and outline of that Sacred Word which He Himself taught His servants by His Holy inspiration to deliver." Miller, Scrivener, Hoskier, and Burgon are in the same stall.

Dean John William Burgon will NOT be found listed in Moyer's *Who's Who in Church History* (Moody Press). *Westcott* and *Hort* are.

Was Dean Burgon a "Biblical" scholar? Did he know the contents of the Bible? Well, put it this way: he knew what the bark looked like on individual trees in the New Testament. Burgon could never "see de foest for lookin' at de trees." Scrivener and Miller had the same trouble: so do Stewart Custer and Zane Hodges. There is no evidence that one man in the list ever lead a sinner to saving faith in Jesus Christ. In the words of John R. Rice, Dean Burgon was "guilty of the folly of a

short-sighted FOOL." So was Scrivener, Pickering, Bullinger, and Miller.

Are you getting the "drift of the discourse" yet?

Burgon's works are TOOLS for *tradesmen*; tradesmen who believe in the Greek Textus Receptus (or the "Majority" Text) as against the eclectic rubbish recommended by Bob Jones University, Moody, Fuller, and Wheaton (Nestle, Aland, Metzger, Hort, et al., and other Alexandrians). Burgon's "tools" are the best in the tool box. What do they have to do with learning the Bible? Well, about as much as Stewart Custer's *Treasury of New Testament Synonyms*, or his booklets on *Which Translation?* and *Tools for Teaching and Preaching the Bible*. Stewart Custer—who was given a reputation as a scholar by his employer (Bob Jones III)—was Chairman of Bible in BJU, and "professor of ancient languages." As Robert Dick Wilson and A. T. Robertson, Custer was one of the dumbest Bible blockheads that ever fell off the back of an Alexandrian dumpster. When called upon to refute Ruckman's "peculiar teachings," the child could not produce ten verses of scripture to answer ten teachings with. (We produced 120 verses for the ten teachings and on two of them more than forty verses appeared.) Unlike Robertson and Wilson, Custer had no ability to produce anything original or any ability to compile a mass of facts for both sides of any question. In his pitiful pamphlet on *The Truth About the KJV Controversy*, Custer's "Bibliography" doesn't contain one work by one author who backs up the Authorized Text of the British Protestant Reformation on the Textus Receptus. He gives Scofield, but only as proof that 1 John 5:7, Acts 8:37, and 2 Thessalonians 2:2 don't have any business being in the Bible as they are found in the AV. All that follows is Edmond Heibert, William Kelly, Leon Morris, Bruce Metzger (the "new" NRSV which lines up with "Women's Lib"), A. T. Robertson, Kurt Aland, Eberhard Nestle, Alexander Souter, Westcott, and Hort. Completely missing from his scholarly "sources" are ALL the works by Scrivener, Hoskier, Burgon, Miller, Hills, Pickering, Wilkinson, Colwell, Fuller, Hodges, Waite, and Sturz. Between them, those men produced more than THREE TIMES the textual material produced by Custer's sources, but all of

it was against Custer's sources. Under the guise of pretending to be "scholarly," Custer simply struck out all the evidence that contradicted his theories. That is what they call "scholarship" at Bob Jones University, in 1991. Custer's pamphlet is carried by every Christian bookstore on every "Christian" campus in America. It is absolutely without merit as a Biblical work, a scriptural work, a Christian work, or a "scholarly" work. It is nothing but one sided, half---- (I forbear at this point!) anti-intellectualism. In truth, it is nothing but a paper block or paper shield to protect the apostate Bible correctors on the faculty at BJU (\$\$\$). It has no scholastic utility at all.

This means that what often passes as "Biblical scholarship" is not even "Christian" scholarship; it is just more of what you read in Chapter 2, except, occasionally, a different *profession* accompanies the irrational nonsense. Someone (it would have to be a genuine "scholar") should do a research paper from original sources on "The Personal Conversion Experiences" of F. F. Bruce, Fenton John Anthony Hort, Von Soden, Konstantin Von Tischendorf, Karl Lachmann, F. Blass, G. R. Driver, P. E. Kahle, G. E. Wright, G. W. Anderson, H. M. Orlinsky, H. E. Ryle, F. C. Grant, E. J. Goodspeed, L. Zuntz, B. M. Metzger, H. J. Vogels, C. H. Dodd, H. B. Kurt Aland, J. W. Barnes, Neville Birdsall, Ernest Colwell, Kenneth Clark, F. C. Swete, Conybeare, and associates. What a boon and what a blessing this would be to Bible-believing Christians engaged in street preaching, church building, soul winning, and overseas evangelism!

Which ones were saved and which ones weren't? Who knows? Nobody checked on them. They were accepted at face value (Josh. 9:4-5) with no questions asked because of their collating and researching abilities.

When one considers it—and I never met a real "scholar" in my life who could consider ANYTHING in history or the Bible where he didn't like it—it is much like the Roman Catholic practise of accepting at face-value anything that Origen, Tertullian, Justin Martyr, Ireneaus, Cyprian, Augustine, or Polycarp said because *they like it*. Or, again, one cannot fail to notice how similar all of this stupid, non-scientific, non-

objective, anti-intellectual, emotional approach is to the "scholarship" of the Bible-rejecting evolutionists (humanists and atheists). They don't check the facts at all; they accept a theory *if it lines up with their previous theories*. If any factual evidence were produced that proved the first basic theory (upon which they had based all of the subsequent theories) was FALSE, they would reject that evidence like a Jewish Rabbi would turn down a pork chop. As a matter of demonstrable fact (proved empirically on several score occasions), they do just THAT Creation research work has been rejected in the last forty years because it was done by Henry Morris and company (creation researchers. Walter Lammerts, John Klotz, Bolton Davidheiser, John Whitcomb, Harold Slusher, Gary Parker, H. Douglas Dean, Russell C. Artist, John N Moore) There are Creation-Science Associations in Brazil, Australia, India, Canada, England, South Africa, Korea, Mexico, Germany, and New Zealand.

Was Keith Ellicott saved? He is an "authority" on Greek New Testament texts. Was Eldon J. Epp saved? He was THE authority for *New Testament Textual Criticism*. Was Gordon Fee saved? He published articles on *Codex Sinaiticus in the Gospel of John*, *Corrections of Bodmer Papyrus II*, *Critique of Pickering*, *Modern Textual Criticism and the Majority Text*, *P66 and P75*, *Eclecticism*, and *the Texts of John in Origen and Cyril of Alexandria*, plus "*New Greek and Coptic Manuscripts*." Ready to accept him as an authority for revising the AV again (that will be 200 times since 1800)?

Well not if he was a "short-sighted fool," guilty of "spiritual manslaughter"—*no*. You say, "Well those are different fields...." Right. Ellicott's field, Epp's field, and Fee's field are not in the New Testament. The soul-winning is. The short-sighted fool is always *non-Biblical* or *anti-Biblical* So he is a "Biblical" scholar, right?

Are you getting the message, yet?

Being an educated intellectual doesn't guarantee:

1. That you are a Christian.
2. That you are "Biblical" in your conduct.
3. That you are even a saved sinner.

4. That you have a BRAIN in your head when it comes to scriptural and Biblical truths.

Dr. Edward Hills (a saved, five-point Calvinistic, Amillennial Presbyterian) wrote on *The Harmonization of the Caesarian Text of Mark*, *The Inter-relationship of the Caesarian Manuscripts*, *A New Approach to the Old Egyptian Text*, and *The King James Bible Defended*. Hills could not find the restoration of Israel, the fulfillment of the promises to Abraham (Gen. 13-15), David (2 Sam 7), or Moses (Deut. 28-32), or the Judgment Seat of Christ in the scriptures. His "higher education" ruined him, at least where PREDICTION (see Chapter 2) was involved.

There is something about higher Christian education that blinds a Christian and prevents him from finding the truth.

Here is a Christian genius if you ever met one—if he was saved. This is J. C. Hoskier, whose scholarship would put Hort in the shade and Westcott in the grave. He wrote *Codex B and its Allies* (a vast, detailed work, which I have), *Dates on the Bohairic Versions*, *The Text of the Apocalypse*, *Notes on Eastern and Caesarean Texts*, *Studies in the Chester-Beatty Codex of the Pauline Epistles*, and *The Authorized Version of 1611*.

Was Hoskier saved?

Why didn't you find out before you accepted his scholarship?

You say, "Well why didn't you find out if all the AV translators were saved before you accepted their scholarship?" I never dealt with *them* or *their scholarship* for a minute. I dealt with the TEXT they produced and I dealt with the Holy Spirit who bore witness to *that text*.

Is that what you did with Hoskier? No you didn't, and that isn't what you did with any man listed in this book. I've already listed over 320.

Got the scenery down yet? Know your longitude and latitude?

Let's try F. G. Kenyon and G. D. Kilpatrick, shall we? I mean "Christian scholarship," Jack! I mean "Biblical scholarship," baby! You bet your britches.

Let's see now *Books and Readers in Ancient Greek and*

Rome, A Textus Receptus Redivivus? Our Bible and Ancient Manuscripts, The Possessive Pronouns in the New Testament, An Analysis of Antiochene Exegesis of Galatians 4:24-26, The Order of Some Nouns and Adjective Phrases in the New Testament, Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, An Eclectic Study of the Text of Acts, Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible, The New Testament in Historical and Contemporary Perspective (Oh yeah, man! There is that news media stuff!), *Epithuein and Epikrinein in the Greek Bible*, and *Atticism and the Future of ZHN*.

Man! You would *have* to believe those birds. They are too smart to even argue with. Amen? Boy, if they recommend ten thousand changes in the New Testament you sure better hop to it and "make them there changes"! Do I hear an "Amen"?

Kilpatrick and Kenyon never led one soul to Jesus Christ in a lifetime. Kilpatrick and Kenyon never founded, or pastored (or even attended) a New Testament local church in sixty years. Kilpatrick and Kenyon couldn't keep a class of teenagers awake for thirty minutes teaching any chapter in the New Testament. Kilpatrick and Kenyon (like Kirsopp Lake, J. F. Klijn, Sake Kubo, Bruce Metzger, and Eugene Nida) were just two among hundreds of backslidden, dead, cold, powerless Christians who publically and privately VIOLATED every New Testament commandment to live the Pauline life and practise the Pauline ministry: see Acts 20:20, 21, 26-32; 24:25; 1 Tim. 6:1-6; 2 Tim. 4:5; Titus 1.9-13. They did this while correcting the Pauline Epistles.

And what further shall we say of M. F. Unger, L. D. Twilley, Nigel Turner, A. P. Wikgren, Arthur Voobus, Gleason Archer Jr., Gunther Zuntz, R. V. G. Tasker, C. Tarelli, and of all other non-Biblical, non-Pauline, powerless, prayerless Christian intellectuals—if they were "Christians"—who devoted their lives to getting rid of your Bible?

They did not preach on the street: *Paul did*. They did not weep over lost souls: *Paul did*. They corrected the Old Testament constantly: *Paul did not*. They were never arrested or abused for telling sinners how to be saved: *Paul was*. They restored no one's faith in absolute authority: *Paul did* (1 Thess.

2:13, Eph. 6:10-15, Acts 24:14). They did not establish local churches: *Paul did*. They did not set their affections on things above: *Paul did*. They did not use the word "scripture" interchangeably for GOD: *Paul did* (Rom. 9:17, Gal. 3:8). They spent their lifetime disobeying 1 Corinthians 4:16, 11:1; Philipians 3:17; 1 Thessalonians 2:14; Hebrews 6:12, and 1 Timothy 1:16. They were non-Pauline, non-Biblical, anti-scriptural "Christians" if indeed, they were Christians at all. None of them said, wrote, or recorded a Pauline confession of faith (1 Tim. 1) as to their personal conversion (1 Cor. 15:8, 9), or when they became a new creature (Gal. 1:15, 16; 2 Cor. 5:19).

You are supposed to accept their scholarship where it contradicts the BOOK. Their scholarship is what you get when you attend any major Christian *college, university, or seminary* in America, Europe, or Canada.

My list has not been exhaustive, but another two dozen names would "round it out." We call this "*The Scholar's Union*," or "*The Alexandrian Cult*." We print their official religious creed in every issue of the *Bible Believers' Bulletin* under "The Creed of the Alexandrian Cult" (1980-1991). Not five men in that Cult, for the last four hundred years, resembled the New Testament ministry laid out in the Pauline Epistles and the Book of Acts. (You can see why my thesis at BJU [1953] on "A History of Practical Theology in the Light of the Book of Acts" went over like a lead balloon!)

I have never met a Greek or Hebrew teacher, or a textual critic, or "manuscript detective" in *forty-two years* that resembled ANY kind of New Testament Christianity as found in the Pauline Epistles. Robertson, Wuest, Zodhiates, Rendall, Nicoll, and the writers for *The Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* are about as scriptural and "Pauline" as Cornelius Stam or Bob Jones IV. No Christian with the sense that God gave to a brass monkey would ever mention Merrill Unger, J. G. Machen, Benjamin Warfield, E. S. English, C. S. Lewis, or Arthur Farstad in the same breath with General William Booth, Sam Jones, Billy Sunday, or J. Frank Norris.

Let us close this chapter by cutting out a prime slice of

prime roast beef which could well feed every man mentioned in the last ten pages, at least where Bible critics and Bible correctors are concerned. Let us pick an unimpeachable character whose "genius and scholarship" must forever remain "absolutely UNQUESTIONED." (That is: above criticism—a sacred cow. M. L. King Jr., "Do not open until 2027 A.D.") I have, here, a man who surely will be accepted by Pensacola Christian Schools, Notre Dame, Santa Rosa Christian Schools, Baylor, Tennessee Temple, Furman, BBC, Liberty University, Stetson, Bob Jones University, Mercer, Wheaton, Moody, and Fuller, as well as Oxford, Cambridge, Princeton, Pacific Coast Bible College, Harvard, Yale, and Chicago Divinity School (plus the NCC, the Jesuit priests, Dean Luther Weigle, and all the Liberals and Modernists). I have here a "giant" of such "genius" and Christian "faith" that it was said of him by more than twenty parties: "When we read our New Testament today with confidence and ease, we should do it with gratitude for such scholars as...."! And again: "His work was a gain for TRUTH which made the solid reliability of the rest of the New Testament stand forth all the more!" "He was criticized for his departure from the traditional text (*AV*, 1611) but the tide of scholarship in all lands was on his side!" (Laodicean Tide: 1880-1930). "A special professorship was created in Leipzig for him and he was given the right to insert "von" before his name as a sign of NOBILITY!" "His definitive edition of the New Testament, based on Sinaiticus, appeared in 1872...he reconstructed a better and more ancient text than Luther and the *AV* translators...his manuscripts were far better...he said 'I am confronted with a sacred task: the struggle to regain the original form of the New Testament'!"

My God, what a noble Christian endeavor!

Was he saved? No one knows to this day. He never *professed* any date for any conversion to *anything*. He could be in HELL right now.

But! "We (that's *you*, stupid, if you are a "Christian"!) should occasionally pause in thanks for his labors, and men like him, who have pushed back the centuries to bring the text of *OUR* scriptures ever more close to what was originally written."

Who bought that pious DUNG ("Crap" in the vulgate, but something much plainer in the "koine")?

Benjamin Warfield, Robert Dick Wilson, A. T. Robertson, Bob Jones Jr., J. G. Machen, Bob Jones III, Spiros Zodhiates, James Price, Fred Afman, Stewart Custer, Bob Jones IV, and every Bible teacher and Language professor in every major Christian college, university, and seminary on the North American continent (1901-1991).

That was Konstantin Tischendorf (1815-1874) who never led a soul to Christ in his life. He couldn't *preach* the Bible, he couldn't *teach* the Bible, and he didn't *understand* the Bible but his "find" ("Aleph" Sinaiticus) was the other manuscript used by Nestle, Aland, Metzger, Hort, Schaff, and company, to make three thousand changes in "our scriptures" (see above). In *The Christian's Handbook of Biblical Scholarship* you will find a detailed analysis of Sinaiticus. It is one of the four most corrupt Uncials ever written, and it contains New Testament Apocrypha in the New Testament. When this poor, deluded, backslidden "Christian" (or lost sinner; take your pick) found his TBV (Trash Basket Version) in St. Catherine's Monastery and realized he had found the post-Christian Septuagint (Feb. 1859)—written two hundred years *after* the completion of the New Testament—he ran upstairs into his cubby-hole with more than two hundred pages of Old and New Testament to translate, and guess what he picked to translate *first of all*, when he had all of the Pauline Epistles right in front of him!

C'mon! Guess! Surely, by now, you know how much real intelligence any "Christian" intellectual has after rejecting the word of God and the words of God. C'mon! Guess! *Romans*? No. *Ephesians*? No. *Matthew*? *Mark*? *Luke*? *John*? No, no, no!

He took the Codex to his "cell" and sat up all night copying *The Epistle To Barnabas* out of the New Testament (John Reumann, *The Romans of Bible Scripts and Scholars*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 65, p. 155). A "spiritual giant" if you ever met one, buster! Man, what a genius! Boy, think how he stood three hours a day, fourteen days in a row, before the guarded Vaticanus (manuscript "B") and memorized the beginning lines on *twenty pages* out of 390 pages. (He never


did memorize half of Vaticanus, or even *half of one chapter* in one book in it. You got that baloney from the Scholar's Union who were busy trying to deify one of their sacred cows (see above).

(Reumann, *op cit.*, p. 151). "Here was a veritable 'apostolic succession' of scholars, tracing back and establishing the text in Sinaiticus." What was this apostolic succession? Paul-Timothy-Titus (2 Tim 2:2)-John-Ignatius-Polycarp? No; this "apostolic succession" had nothing to do with evangelistic, Biblical, missionary, soul-winning activities at all. This (according to Reumann) was an apostolic succession of "short-sighted fools" guilty of "spiritual manslaughter," for the succession Reumann gives is Pamphilus and Origen, who came from Clement and Philo (see *The History of the New Testament Church*, Vol. I, Chapter 5). Their "successors" are Jerome, Augustine, the popes, the Jesuits, Stewart Custer, Loyola, Dominic, Bloody Mary, Adolph Hitler, Fidel Castro, Frank Sinatra, Hort, Westcott, Torquemada, Rock Hudson, Charlemagne, Mussolini, Edward Panosian, Phillip Schaff, Bob Jones Jr., Herman Goering, Bernadette Devlin, Guy Fawkes, Heinrich Himmler, the *NIV*, and *NASV* committees, and Bob Jones III.

The *ASV*, *NASV*, and *NIV* are all based on Sinaiticus and Vaticanus.

So much for Christian "intellectuals." Tischendorf, after signing a paper with the Greek orthodox monks at St. Catherine's Monastery on Sinai, to the effect that he would *return* the manuscript when he was through with it, **SOLD** it to the Czar of Russia (*op cit.*, p. 157). To alibi for his fraud and covetousness—which violated all the Greek texts of all his *Pauline passages*: see 1 Timothy 6—the scholars claimed that since Tischendorf was using the manuscripts for **SCHOLARLY** purposes (Ahhh! That is why the scholarship must be "unquestioned," isn't it!?) no one should be particularly concerned about personal honor or professional honor (*op cit.*, p. 158).

Paul: "some affirm...**Let us do evil, that good may come? whose damnation is just**" (Rom. 3:8) We may presume that Tisch-baby was so interested in adding one false book to



CAN YOU IDENTIFY THE INTELLECTUALS WHO FELL INTO THE BLACK HOLE?
(FOR ANSWERS. SEE PAGE 4397)

"HERE IS THE HEAD OF OUR
BIBLE DEPARTMENT! A
SCHOLAR AND A GENTLEMAN!"



THE REVERENT "BIBLICIST"

BEIJING: 1990



THE CHINESE RIFLEMAN WHO LOST HIS RIGHT TO CARRY
A SEMI-AUTOMATIC WEAPON

THE
ATHEIST

UNKNOWN
FUTURE

THE
ROMAN
CATHOLIC

UNKNOWN
SAVIOR

THE
FUNDAMENTALIST

UNSEEN
"ORIGINALS"

THE
EVOLUTIONIST


UNKNOWN
ORIGINS

THE
AGNOSTIC

UNKNOWN
GOOD
GOD

ALL TRUTHS ARE RELATIVE!

THE GREAT ECUMENICAL UNITY: AGNOSTICISM



" HEAVEN AND EARTH SHALL PASS AWAY BUT MY WORDS
SHALL NOT..... "



HUMANISM VERSUS REVELATION

"WELL WHAT ELSE ARE
YOU IN ADDITION TO BEING
A THIEF AND A LIAR?"



HE STOLE YOUR BIBLE AND THEN LIED
ABOUT HIS REASON FOR DOING IT!

DIC



THE "INTELLECTUAL"



BIBLE BELIEVERS

WELL O' SADAM
HUSSEIN, DIDNT HAVE
NOTHIN ON US!



THE TRANSLATING "GULF CRISIS" -----1991

"YOU'VE GOT TO BELIEVE HIM! HE'S A 'GODLY' BIBLICIST,
AND BESIDES THAT WE PAY HIS SALARY!"



WHAT GOES ON INSIDE A "BASTION OF ORTHODOXY"

GENESIS 3:1

THE SCHOLARS' UNION




THE OLDEST "CULT" ON EARTH

"WHAT JA THINK I'D DO WITH 'EM? I ATE 'EM AND BURIED THEIR BONES!"




"BUT WHERE DID THEY GO? WHAT HAPPENED TO THEM? THERE WERE 120 OF THEM! WHAT DID YOU DO WITH THEM?!"

NKSV TLB RSV
 BENTLEY AFD PDG
 PHILLIPS
 GLOUCESTER NASV NOELAC RV
 WYLMOUTH NWT FENTON
 NAB NTG MARDON CDD
 AMBLIFIELD NIV XZY
 PSV WEST TEV RIVERSIDE NRSV



"..UPDATING" THE ARCHAIC ELIZABETHAN ENGLISH



NEW YORK 1991 POLICEMEN, JOURNALISTS, AND REPORTERS CAN CARRY PISTOLS

the New Testament that he forgot to read the man he was told to follow (see references above) Was Tischendorf a Christian? If he was, would you follow him three feet in broad daylight? WHY? I'll tell you why, but I will use Elgin Moyer to do it, "The crowning work of his life being his eighth edition of the Greek New Testament with its large critical apparatus It remains, by reason of the *abundance* of its data [There it is! "Collation" is the name of the game!] a standard book of reference for the text of *the New Testament*" (p 407, *Who's Who in Church History*).

Not any New Testament I would consult to find out anything.

"The bigger the belfry, the more room for the bats. All the clowns are not in the circus." Tischendorf was a THIEF: a stupid, "Christian" thief.

"Christian intellectuals" can be taken with the same dose of salts that UNSAVED intellectuals can be taken. That is how they should be taken. Tischendorf is as fine a representative as I know of a genuine, modern, New Testament "Biblical scholar" whose "unquestioned scholarship" is "recognized" by all Christian scholars as making "great leaps forward" in understanding the "true state" of the "original, plenary, verbally inspired autographs!" I have a copy of the Sinaiticus New Testament here in my office. It is about as useful and spiritual and as "revealing" as a book on Projected Hoe Handle Production in South Dakota Tischendorf was a "short-sighted fool" according to 1 Corinthians 1:19, 3:18, Colossians 2:3-8, Proverbs 18:1-2, Isaiah 28-29.

CHAPTER FOUR

Who Then Are The Real Scholars?

In the Biblical realm, one is most likely to find a real scholar among the *commentators*. It is impossible to "comment" on 31,000-plus verses without having done considerable research on the words in the verses. True, it is possible to bluff your way through, like Dummelow, by simply referring to the Hebrew or the Greek (or an *RV*) everytime you hit a place you know nothing about. (Dummelow hits about five thousand of these in 31,000 verses.) A one volume commentary, say, the *Wycliffe Commentary* doesn't take near the research that a full set does; say, *John Peter Lange's Commentary* or *Adam Clarke's Commentary*. To really "comment" on the Bible, a genuine scholar would not only have to have an acquaintance with Greek, Hebrew, and Aramaic (plus a smattering of Latin, Arabic, and Coptic), but a grounding in Biblical Archaeology, Biblical Customs, Theology, Textual Criticism, Manuscript Evidence, and the works of other commentators and exegetes. In addition to this, is an item that is usually entirely missing from the commentators' background; so much so, that when Ellicott, Matthew Henry, Williams, Clarke, Lange, the *Pulpit Commentary*, *The Bible Expositor and Illuminator*, *The New English Commentary*, *The Wycliffe Commentary*, and *The Liberty Baptist Commentary*, etc. are assembled, we find hardly a trace of this necessary ingredient. This ingredient is a thorough personal acquaintance with the *practical* aspects of evangelism, church building, missions, missionaries, martyrs, church people, Bible teaching, church history, personal dealings with God and pastoring. Scholars don't make good preachers. Most of them are "short-sighted fools," and the rest of them follow Christ "afar off."

In a while I am going to signal out three of the greatest Biblical scholars who ever lived. I have not mentioned their names up until now. But these three men actually did spend time IN the Bible; that is, they spent hours and hours studying the *King James text of the Authorized Version*. These men are never to be confused with people like Hengstenberg, Delitzsch, Perowne, Salmond, Rendall, Hackett, Alford, Hort, Nestle, and Schaff. Alexander Hislop is not one of them, although Hislop was certainly a scholar and a great one. He is one of the most detailed and thorough researchers you will find anywhere among professing Christians. Hislop was a *scholar*. He was not a *Biblical* scholar but his work on *The Two Babylons* will remain the definitive work on the theological system of the Roman Catholic church to the end of time. It has never been improved upon and never will be. He is not "recognized" by much of anybody, but his scholarship was vastly superior to that of Benjamin Warfield, Kenneth Wuest, Spiros Zodhiates, J. G. Machen, R. A. Torrey, W. B. Riley, John Broadus, or B. H. Carroll.

Phillip Schaff was a great scholar, there is no question about that. He was anything BUT a "Biblical scholar." His service as head of the *ASV* committee of 1901 puts him down as one of the most deceived and unfaithful professing Christians that ever "pimped" for the Whore on the Seven Hills (see Hislop!). But when it came to history, Phillip was a genius and as great a scholar as Geisler, Kurtz, Mosheim, D'Aubigne, Pliny, LaTourette, Froom, Migne, Dollinger, or a dozen others. When it came to the BOOK, Schaff (as Robert Dick Wilson, A. T. Robertson, and Edward Hills) was as blind as a bat backing in backwards.

Phillip Schaff (1819-1893) was a scholar, no doubt about it. When you study his eight volumes on *The History of the Christian Church* you are reading the work of a genuine scholar; a bookworm who must have spent an average of ten hours a day in research and collation. Time after time, you will find sections such as "Luther's Personal Life," or "The Arian Controversy," or "Worship of Mary in the Middle Ages," or "The Pelagian Controversy," or "John Huss' Theology," or "The

Doctrine of Transubstantiation," prefaced by a list of source references nearly half as long as the material which follows. Among these source references will be found books, letters, official documents, polemics, apologetics (and even handwritten notes) from 1500 to 1800 years before the time of Phillip's work. Some of the writings are in French, Latin, Greek, Coptic, Arabic, and Syriac and many more are in German, English, Italian, and Spanish. In addition to these eight volumes, Schaff edited three volumes on *The Creeds of Christendom*, *The Theological Propaedeutic*, and *A Companion to the Greek Testament* (note the lie!) and the *English Version* (note the lie again!), and then proceeded to edit twenty-five volumes of *The Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers*, plus Lange's *Biblewerk* (a commentary on the Holy Scriptures) and four volumes of *The International Illustrated Commentary of the New Testament*.

Was Phillip Schaff a Christian scholar?

Well, he professed to believe in the articles of the Apostles' Creed which every unsaved Catholic and Episcopal has professed to believe in for four hundred years.

Was Phillip Schaff a *Biblical* scholar?

Well, do you mean "Did he study what he believed?" or do you mean "Did he mess with what he didn't believe?" If you asked the second question you got the affirmative answer.

Phillip Schaff was a *Roman Catholic anti-Bible blockhead*. There are more than five thousand children in Florida (Jacksonville, Fort Myers, Tallahassee, Pensacola, Fort Walton, Panama City, Tampa, St. Pete, and Orlando) between the ages of twelve and eighteen who know more about soul winning, prayer, prophesy, and *salvation* than Phillip Schaff knew at the age of seventy-four, after studying and writing for sixty years.

P.S. Do you remember those eight volumes of *The History of the Christian Church*, given above? Well they aren't about the "Christian Church" at all. They are about organized, professing Christianity. The church "which is HIS BODY" (Eph. 1:23, Col. 1:18) is not the subject of Schaff's history; and neither is the local New Testament church the subject of Schaff's church history. He never *belonged to* or *attended* a New Testament church a day in his life. He belonged to "The German Reformed

Church" and his mind was destroyed at Tübingen, Halle, and Berlin by F. C. Bauer, C. F. Schmidt, Julius Müller, Tholuck, Neander, Godet, and Monod. Not one man in the list led one soul to Jesus Christ in a lifetime.

If they WERE "Christians"—and six of them left no testimony as to their conversion at anytime in their life—they had bloody hands (Acts 20:26), followed their Lord afar off, and were (as a group) "short-sighted fools."

"For the wisdom of the world is foolishness with God."

You see, the professionals in the Alexandrian Cult kidded you into thinking that if a man professed Jesus Christ he would never THINK of subscribing to "the wisdom of this world." Guess again.

By now, I have given you the names of 390 "scholars."

There are not three Biblical scholars in the lists.

"The wisdom of this world" is what makes up the curriculum and courses of every Christian university, seminary, and college in America if that school believes in "relative truths," pragmatic humanism, or Christian scholarship as the final authority. For these institutions, **"all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge"** (Did you get that last word?) are NOT to be found in Jesus Christ. They are to be found in the researches and collations of professing Christians who are intellectuals and sit in judgment on the BOOK. We have already given you the names of more than fifty of these men. It might be safe to say that HALF of them were saved men. None of them were "Pauline" in any sense of the word. In my work on *The History of the New Testament Church*—a real history of the New Testament local church; not "The Christian Church"—you will find an analysis of "The Pauline Obsession."

Briefly, this is a preacher or "prophet" complex that sooner or later effects all intellectuals. As they rise higher and higher in their own estimation, they approach the place of "spokesman for God." You can see this amply demonstrated in Beethoven's Ninth (Choral) Symphony. The artist, musician, philosopher, writer, historian, scholar must play "God." It means that every dead orthodox apostate from Eusebius to Donald Waite, and every apostate Fundamentalist from Origen to Bob Jones IV,

likes to pretend that they (and their friends) are like PAUL. They want the masculine glamour that comes from being a full grown Bible-believing, street preaching MALE without being masculine themselves, or believing the Book, or preaching on the street. They want the Silver Stars and Congressional Medals while playing in the sandpile (see "The Brownies and Campfire Girls" in *Problem Texts*, 1980, Chapter 11). There is nothing about one member of the NIV committee, or the NRSV committee, or the NASV committee, that resembled Paul in character, aim, goal, motive, purpose, plan, preaching, beliefs, lifestyle, results, or opposition. A discussion of this will be found in the Introduction to *The History of the New Testament Church* (Vol. I, by the author) on pages xiv-xx.

You can imagine how the faculty at BJU took to that "Pauline Obsession" back in 1953! They have had plenty of reason since then for slandering Bible believers as a "cult" or "Ruckmanites," believe you me! In 1953, Bob Jones Jr., Marshall Neal, and Stewart Custer saw "the handwriting on the wall." It was "anti-intellectual."

Christian colleges all take pride in INTELLECTUALISM. They call it "high academic standards."

The press calls sex perverts "gays," and calls whores "hustlers."

BJU calls destructive Bible critics "reverent Bibliocists."

The press calls whoremongers "swingers," and calls GRID "AIDS."

We have discussed these matters in "The Mark of the Jackass" (Chapter 3 in *The Damnation of a Nation*, 1991).

Now, today, it is much easier to research and collate material because of computers, libraries, film strips, slides, compediums, omnibuses, and so forth. Still, a man must spend some time at a desk to get all of the junk together (see *Chronicle of the Twentieth Century*, 1987, 1300 pages). There are some valuable works published by Eerdmans, Baker, and Zondervan where twentieth century writers have collated a vast amount of material such is "useful." Furthermore, many of these writers are "born again" men. But you must be careful, for the studious intellectuals among them will quickly classify ANY scholar they

thought highly of as a "Christian." This is to protect their own "godliness." They don't want you to think they have been keeping company with the Biblical "dogs and swine" described in 2 Peter 2. The vomit-eating dogs and mud-bathing swine in 2 Peter 2 are all *teachers and prophets*: i.e. religious "scholars." (See 2 Peter 2) You never saw so many "godly" apostates in your life 'till you begin to read men like Curtis Hutson, John R. Rice, Bob Jones IV, Stewart Custer, Doug Kutilek, Robert Sumner, and Baptist pastors who graduated from BBC or Liberty University. Every destructive critic of the Bible who "named the name of Christ" was "GODLY." It may have never occurred to anyone that there has never been a real SCHOLAR on the Board of *The Sword of the Lord* since its inception, and BJU and BBC have not turned out one real scholar in fifty years. Furthermore, they have never produced a faculty member who was a real scholar; he was either one before he got there, or he never became one. J. Barton Payne, William Brunner, and "Brokey" (Charles Brokenshire) were slightly scholarly (1948-1953) but certainly not of the caliber of Hislop, Bullinger, Schaff, Migne, Nestle, Kurtz, Mosheim, LaTourette, Robertson, Henry Morris, or A. E. Wilder Smith.

The reality is that Wilbur Smith (*Therefore Stand*) was not a scholar, nor was B. B. Warfield. They wrote some good apologetics; a lot of people do. In the 1980's we had a host of "Battle" books and "Controversy" books put out by the Alexandrian Cult (see Appendices No. 2, 3, 4 in *The Bible Believer's Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*. 1989) but every single one of them was a thin, shallow, milky work consisting of guarded comments on the works of Hoskier, Burgon, Scrivener, Hills, Hort, Miller, Pickering, Nestle, Fuller, and Wilkinson. Naive Christians presumed that these tractuses were written by "scholars." There wasn't one real scholar in the lot. Anyone who can write (and has the time) can critique two or three works by another man by using the comments of some other men. Men-followers and men-pleasers, who worship men, do not have a real Bible scholar's HEART. A real Bible scholar is interested in digging up scriptural truth—see John 17:17, John 14:6, and don't forget John 16:13—and will go to nearly

any length to dig it up, no matter how much time it takes to do it. A real scholar will not go off on half-cocked theories about "Lucian recensions," "older and better manuscripts," "affirmative action," "black holes," "acquired characteristics," "the immaculate conception," "good, godly men," "safe sex," "detente and glasnost," "peace on earth," "intrinsic probability," "traditional theological interpretations," "looking forward to the cross," "if he is not Lord of ALL He is not Lord at all," "closer to the originals," "child abuse," "life styles and values," "unavailable original autographs," "the final solution," "the war on poverty," "Earth Day," or the "scholarship" of Pensacola Christian College or Liberty University.

"For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God."

Now, W. Robertson Nicoll was a scholar. He edited four volumes (averaging 550 pages each) of *The Expositor's Greek Testament*. Here is a "veritable gold mine of information" and an "embarrassment of riches" for destructive critics ("Christians," of course; everyone of them!) of the *Authorized Version*. Here are H. A. Kennedy, A. S. Peake, S. D. Salmond, Frederick Rendall, J. H. Bernard, Bengel, Schnedermann, Zockler, Alford, Waite, Deismann, Grotius, Koppe, DeWette, Tregelles, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Origen, Abbott, Stier, Sanday, Holtzman, Robertson, Julicher, Meyer, Haupt, Weiss, Von Soden, Beet, Moule, Ellicott, Lightfoot, Franke, Klopoper, Hofmann, Ewald, and Oltramare at their very best.

Was Nicoll a Christian? Who knows? Was he a *Biblical* scholar? Who knows? Was he a short-sighted fool? Absolutely, beyond the shadow of a doubt. So were everyone of his "collaborators" listed above. Not one evangelistic preacher or personal worker in the entire crew.

I'll go "one more" before telling you the horrible, shocking, unsavory, ghastly, Biblical truth.

One more: *The Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by Gerhard Kittel, with Geoffrey Bromiley doing some translating for him (Wm. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, 1964). One may find several more works similiar to this (*Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, Harris,

Archer and Waltke, Moody Press, 1980), but this one will do just fine as an outstanding A-1 example of scholarly compendiums dealing with a subject. (There are many dealing with military histories, mythology, famous entertainers, books of "records," American and European literature (or authors), world religions, Demonology, art and artists, music and musicians, etc. At any bookstore today they are a "dime a dozen." It doesn't take a whole lot of "scholarship" these days to amass an omnibus of "facts" and "lists" on anything, but it still takes considerable time to gather the stuff, proofread it and put it together.)

Well, here is a neat little work of ten volumes somewhere over eight thousand pages. It is put together by the greatest intellectual brains available to students of "THE" Greek New Testament (which, as anyone knows, is nonsense, there "ain't no sech a thang as THE Greek New Testament." It wasn't even *one Book* when it was written).

Ah! Here it is! Tübingen, Berlin, Halle! Ah, yes! Christian universities set up originally to teach Martin Luther's German Bible. (See "What Ever Happened to Germany?" two articles in the *Bible Believers' Bulletin*, 1989). Ah yes. "Higher Christian Education" that believes in "the fundamentals!" Ah, have we ever seen this one before: Stuttgart, Leipzig, Marburg, Zurich, Rostock, Jena, Erlangen. Hello! Hello? Didn't it go like this in England: Oxford, Cambridge, Christ's College, etc? Or was it Colgate, Union, Crozier, Wheaton, Fuller, Moody? (I get my Alexandrian outlets confused at times.)

Here we have "all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge" available for us through Bauernfeind, Kuhn, Ruhle, Sasse, Schneider, Schlier, Windisch, Debrunner, Greevan, Hermmann, Preisker, Rad, Rengstorf, Schmidt, Stauffer, Delling, Foerster, Hauck, Buschel, Bultmann, and others. Don't worry. ("Not to worry.") They will not fail to consult Aeschylus, Aelius Aristides, Aratus, Antiphanes of Athens, Didymus of Alexandria, Demosthenes of Athens, Kautzsch, H. Lietzmann, Lucian of Samosata, Lactantius, Plotinus of Lycopolis, L. Rademacher, J. F. Schleusner, Zenophon of Athens, Vettius Valens, Theophrastus of Eresos, T Zahn, Cle-

ment of Alexandria, Adolph Deismann, Democritus of Abdera, Euthymius Zigabenus, Epicurus of Samos, Hesiodus of Ascara, Winer, Wettstein, Theophilus, Tatian, Tertullian, Polybus of Megalopolis, E. Preuschen Bauer, and Plutarchus of Chaeronea "in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge"!!

Are you "oriented" yet?

This is the scholarly work that tells us there is no salvation in the *blood of Jesus Christ*, but only in His "dying" (His death). Christ's BLOOD was *just like your blood*.

This was the "Christian scholarship" that put John MacArthur and Thieme on the shelf. It was about as "Biblical" as a compendium of publications by the Watchtower Society or the World Wide "Church of God" (the Armstrongs). Were the writers of the *Theological Dictionary* saved? Who knows? Every scholar in America is so lazy that he would not go to the trouble to find out if these "Christian" scholars were saved or lost. I have already given the names of more than one hundred men in this work who were connected with the destruction of Martin Luther's *Heilige Schrift* and the *Authorized Holy Bible* of the English Reformation. There isn't a Christian scholar living or dead who would care (or dare) to investigate them.

One bunch is called "godly," one bunch is called "reverent," one bunch is called "liberal," one bunch is called "modernistic"—depending upon who is sitting in judgment on who, trying to promote their own "godly" bunch—but no one (no "scholar") will dare write a thesis on the salvation experiences of the men who "set up" the suckers who produced the *RV* (1884), the *ASV* (1901), the *NASV* (1960), the *RSV* (1952), the *NRSV* (1970), the *NIV* (1978), and the *NKJV* (1982).

When it comes to Biblical salvation there is a conspiracy among the members of the Alexandrian Cult (saved or lost) not to publish any papers on the Biblical salvation of the scholars in the Union. No "monogram" was ever published. Not ONE "thesis" was written from Origen's time (200 A.D.) to the time of Zane Hodges (1990). The "godly" scholars were just as silent for 1700 years as the atheists, agnostics, and Catholics. Occasionally, they pretended to be "militant" by attacking a

“modernist,” or they gave the name of an outright infidel who was denying the “fundamentals”—depending upon what they thought the fundamentals were—but no *research* or *collation* was ever made on Biblical salvation in the Scholar’s Union where it touched two main points of New Testament revelation.

I. The personal experience of the “Biblical” scholar himself in relation to his new birth and his encounter with the risen Saviour.

II. The record of this Christian’s attempts to win other sinners to a personal, saving faith in the same Saviour who saved him.

When a modern apostate like Bob Jones IV, Robert Sumner, Gary Hudson, Hindson, Hymers, Horton, Hobson, Dobson, Willmington, Price, Farstad, et al., wants to justify his sins and the sins of his collaborators, he picks a man like Charles Haddon Spurgeon or R. A. Torrey—someone he knows won people to Christ—in spite of the fact that neither man’s ministry resembles his own ministry at all. But that isn’t the half of it; the half of it is that these names are picked in the hopes that you will be stupid enough to believe that Spurgeon and Torrey were “scholars.” Neither man was. Spurgeon was a Baptist pastor who published sermons, and R. A. Torrey was an interdenominational evangelist who wrote two or three practical devotional works. Spurgeon’s *Treasury of David* contains a mass of comments but most of these are by other preachers—not scholars—and where a real scholar inserts an opinion it is usually nothing but *irrational nonsense* (see *The Bible Believer’s Commentary on the Psalms*; especially Books II and III). American Fundamentalism cannot really point to one real “scholar” (A. T. Robertson or Phillip Schaff, for example) who ever led a muskrat to a pond, let alone a sinner to Jesus Christ. But as far as that goes, neither could English Conservatism or German Evangelicism. There is something about “higher Christian education” that is non-Biblical or *anti-Biblical*.

Hiding behind “godly” soul winners who corrected the *King James Bible*, is a modern Funnymentalist “hobby horse.” It always comes from men who are either soul winners—but NOT scholars—or from pseudo scholars who think they are “scholars,” because they don’t win anyone to Christ.

CHAPTER FIVE

The Enemy Of the Scholars

At this point in our "Manifesto" I think you have "become of age." I presume you are mature enough to hear the ghastly, horrible, revolting TRUTH mentioned previously. You should be solid enough now "on your pins" to stand without falling flat on your face. This time, instead of listing these endless lists of deceived, self-righteous, fruitless "Christians" let us list part of eleven verses from the Book that they spent their lives trying to get rid of (or, in the case of BJU, trying to compete with). From these verses we will learn WHY the Scholar's Union was founded, why it exists, and why it will continue to exist in "Daniel's Seventieth Week."

**"Is not my word like as a fire? saith the LORD;
and like a hammer that breaketh the rock in
pieces?"**

A fire will scorch your hair and eyebrows, and will burn the seat out of your britches. A hammer will break your arm or your leg, every bone in your hand or your foot, or it will crush your skull in. Do you think that ANY scholar would be exempt? Do you think that ANY saved scholar is Superman? Then if the verse is TRUE, how do suppose ANY scholar would react to God's WORD (see above) if it ran contrary to what he believed, taught, learned, liked or worshipped?

**"For the word of God is quick, and powerful,
...and is a discerner of the thoughts and in-
tents of the heart...all things are naked and open-
ed unto the eyes of him with whom we have to
do."**

The "we" is not unsaved scholars, unsaved liberals, un-

saved atheists, humanists, and agnostics. The "we," in the passage, was a saved man writing an Epistle.

"These are the true sayings of God...Write: for these words are true and faithful."

"That which was written was upright, even words of truth."

"Bow down thine ear, and hear the words of the wise, and apply thine heart unto my knowledge...Have not I written to thee excellent things in counsels and knowledge, that I might make thee know the certainty of the words of truth?"

"All the words of my mouth are in righteousness; there is nothing froward or perverse in them."

Could you put those verses at the end of ANY book written by any author mentioned in this book? Why not? How would you feel if you were a "scholar" and didn't believe one verse quoted so far?

"For this cause also thank we God without ceasing, because, when ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God, which effectually worketh also in you that believe."

"The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life."

"He that is of God heareth God's words: ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God."

Can you imagine how those verses would strike a "brilliant intellectual" if he didn't believe that the English words were words that God spoke? Can you imagine how that would affect a Christian scholar who had just altered 1 Timothy 6:5, 9, 10; 2 Corinthians 2:7, and Romans 1:18, 25 (NKJV)?

You see, your modern Conservative, Evangelical, and Fun-

damentalist has been exposed for so long to Bible-correcting LIARS he has forgotten the impact that the old English Book, has on LIARS. It is the Christian's own lack of Biblical "perspective" that makes him think that men like those on the *ASV*, *NIV*, *NASV*, *RSV*, *NRSV*, and *NKJV* committees were "Christians," let alone "godly Christians." He took for granted (without any reason for doing so), that when these destructive critics sat down to get rid of the hated English Book that their profession to have believed in a pile of lost papers that no one ever saw was proof they were all saved men (with the best of intentions) engaged in sincerely trying to "help you out." They forgot that the English Book these apostates messed with:

1. Could pierce their intestinal tracts.
2. Break their bones.
3. Burn their britches.
4. Discern and judge their motives.
5. Contradict every false opinion they had about themselves, or anyone else, plus any false idea they had about "originals" or "copies of copies."
6. Point out their individual sins and judge them.
7. Draw judgment on their revising, collating, researching, scholarship, professions of faith, and their personal lives.

I didn't forget it (1949-1991).

I knew what the Book would do to them. It did it to me (1949).

I know what that Book can do to anybody. I have seen it do it more than twenty times a year for forty-two years (1949-1991).

I saw it unhinge Dr. William Brunner (1952) who had been a private pupil of Dr. A. T. Robertson for eight years. Dr. Brunner had memorized all five thousand vocabulary words in Nestle's Greek New Testament. I saw that Book put Dr. Charles Brokenshire into a juvenile fit (1950). Brokey could read, write, and speak something like eight different languages. I saw the old black-backed, 66 caliber, "Elizabethan" English drill a Jesuit Ph.D. from Loyola (Father Sullivan, St. Michael's, Pensacola, Florida) so full of holes he could inhale forty cigars at the same time (1949). I know why every generation from Origen

to Hodges has a Scholar's Union trying to "help" folks out. I will tell you *the* ghastly truth, the *whole* horrible truth, and *nothing but* the damning truth.

The reason all intellectuals (saved or lost) will not leave the Book alone is, *because it will not leave them alone*. It keeps them in an emotional panic.

The Book is alive.

It has the breath of God Almighty on it; the living God (see Isa. 42-48).

That is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. "Accredited scholarship," "recognized scholarship," "godly scholarship," "older and better manuscripts," "years of research," "monumental scholarship," "reverent Biblicists," "militant Fundamentalists," "original autographs," "better renderings," "up-to-date versions," "dynamic equivalence and formal correspondence," "communicators and receptors," "ante penults and vocal shewas," "iota subscriptums and epsilon contract verbs," "hateph quamets and segol," "piel and pual," "genetive absolutes," "infinitive constructs," "steles and wadis," "Dead Sea scrolls," "vellum codices," "Bodmer Papyrii," "Alexandrian and Western families," "plenary and verbal inspiration," "historic positions," etc., are not even a point at issue. Those are just things that you would make a living by (\$\$\$) in a "trade." They are the tradesman's terminology (\$\$\$).

The problem was the BOOK. *The Book is alive.*

It upsets scholars emotionally.

It gives them the convulsive heebie jeebies.

The Book attacks people. The first group it always attacks are scholars who *question what God said* (see Isa. 28, 29; Prov. 22, 24; 1 Cor. 1-3; Gen. 3; Luke 11). It attacks (see 2 Cor. 2 and Rom. 1) all short-sighted fools who mess with it. This explains anything and everything of an intellectual or "scholarly" nature that goes in the "Christian" camp.

It is EVE who wants knowledge so she can "know the mind of God" (Gen. 3). The most scholarly way to get rid of that fundamental basic Biblical truth (see references printed above in bold face) is to pretend that Genesis 3 is Urgeschichte ("Supra-

History')). That is exactly how higher "Christian" scholarship takes it, and don't pat the Fundamentalists on the back before you THINK. That was the position not only of Origen in 200 A.D. but Westcott and Hort in 1880, as they were recommended by the faculty and staff of the Bible Department of *Bob Jones University in 1981* (see *The Truth About the KJV Controversy*, BJU Press, 1981, pp. 5-16, 25).

The pope and the Vatican take the same position. Genesis 3 is NOT literal, so Genesis 3:5 is not really important.

The damning truth is that every intellectual on this earth knows that Book is against him. He knows this instinctively. Furthermore, there has never lived on this earth a saved or lost sinner, with aspirations to become a "scholar," who didn't sense that BOOK was going to be a road block to him, if not an out-and-out enemy on the offensive. The *King James Holy Bible (AV)* is (and has been) the motivating force for all scientific, educational, scholarly, and "Biblical" activities that have gone on on this earth since it was printed. Every intellectual activity on earth today—including all of the New Age humanistic endeavors, all the Biblical researches, all the physicists and astronomers' theories, all the programs set up in the public schools by the NEA, all these race-mixing programs set up by the federal judges, all the social programs carried out by the HRS, all the sessions of the United Nations, and all the operations of the CFR, CIA, NAACP, and the "conspirators,"—is some kind of reaction or response to the contents of a *King James 1611 Authorized Version*. Those who don't believe this or "can't see it" are those who don't know the contents of the *King James Authorized Version*. I may not know the content of a lot of books, canned goods, warehouses, hardware stores, grocery stores, eighteen-wheelers, box cars, Christmas presents, desk drawers, diaries, and ship holds, but, bless God, I know what is in one Book! And what is in *that* Book causes acute distress everytime an intellectual (saved or lost, Catholic or Protestant, Jew or Buddhist, Liberal or Modernists, Evangelical, Atheist, or Evolutionist) picks it up.

Geologists have devoted fifty years of their lifetime trying to get rid of Genesis 1-3. So have Paleontologists, Arch-

aeologists, Chemists, Biologists, Zoologists, and Astronomers. The "New Age" *Humanist Manifesto* is based on the belief that Jesus Christ and Moses were both liars, or at least non-scientific, deceived pagans, and should therefore be eliminated. Every Hebrew and Greek scholar in every school in America would be out of a job it weren't for the persistent presence of *ONE* Book that must be gotten rid of. The life incomes of six to ten thousand educated intellectuals depends upon either proving the Bible is so, or proving it is *not* so, or changing it to line up with something else, or *discussing* its contents, or *preaching* (or teaching) its contents, or inventing cults and sects to *contradict* its contents, or claiming it as a textbook (or reference book) to prove anything from mixed marriages to purgatory. The Book controls *the world*, including those who *hate it, reject it, alter it, deny it, ridicule it, censor it, burn it, pervert it, and try to ignore it.*

To the Book goes the credit for all the scholarship of every scholar mentioned in this work (I have listed over five hundred so far), plus every scholar listed in the Library of Congress, (saved or lost) because everyone of these men were **ATTACKED** by the Book. He responded with belief or unbelief, ridicule or reverence, acceptance or rejection, but never indifference. The Book (*AV* 1611) was in four hundred languages *before* its text was replaced in 1884-1904 with the Roman Catholic Greek text recommended at Bob Jones University (*NASV*). Any German scholar between 1700 and 1990, any French or Italian scholar between 1700 and 1990, any American or English scholar between 1700 and 1990, or any Spanish, Belgian, Polish, or Russian scholar between 1700 and 1990 had access to the *King James Authorized Version*. There are no *real* scholars anywhere on this earth—nor has there been for one hundred years—who could not obtain a copy of the *AV* and read it.

Romans 1; Genesis 3; Proverbs 13, 18; Ecclesiastes 12; Isaiah 28, 29; 1 Corinthians 1-3; Revelation 19-22, and John 8 were right in front of their faces. They sensed the moment they read the words that that Book was an **ADVERSARY**. It had to be eliminated or at least "whittled down" to the size

of the scholars' brains. Face it.

I. Every English-speaking, English-reading, English-writing unsaved scientist, philosopher, astronomer, minister, physicist, biologist, professor, chemist, and astronaut has to spend his entire lifetime (if he is a "scholar") in CONTRADICTING the English account of Genesis 1-3, Psalms 140-150, Isaiah 42-48, or Matthew 24. The Book determines *his calling*.

II. Every Greek and Hebrew teacher, Bible revisor, lexicographer, manuscript detective, textual critic, and professor (if he is a "scholar") has to spend his entire lifetime getting rid of 1 Timothy 6:5, 9, 10, 20; Acts 20:28; 2 Corinthians 2:17; Romans 1:18, 25; Job 41; Isaiah 34, or Mark 16, "dragons," "unicorns," "satyrs," "earrings," (Gen. 24), "borrow" (Exod. 3:22), "affection" (Col. 3:2), "vile" (Phil. 3:21), "study" (2 Tim. 2:15), "hell," etc. He must actually spend a lifetime destroying the faith of English-speaking people in their English Bible. He must do this while professing to be a "Christian" who "speaks in love," (or "writes objectively") and manifests "love" by dealing "kindly" with those "who disagree with him."

III. Every unsaved English-speaking welfare worker, UNESCO worker, HRS worker, press agent, newspaper reporter, feature writer, journalist, newscaster, TV cameraman, newspaper publisher, social worker, and federal judge must spend a lifetime trying to prove that Genesis 1-12, is a LIE. This must be done after being told by Jesus Christ that those were the words of *God* (John 8) that Moses wrote (John 5:45-47) and that if you didn't hear them you were NOT "of God." No one had to have the benefit of ANY Christian scholar's work on Hebrew or Greek texts (or manuscripts, or textual criticism, or revision committees) to understand Genesis 1-12 perfectly. It said a man would rule in his own home; that he would go back to dirt when he died; that he would have to sweat to make a living; that man's dominion was limited to the earth; that women would have pain in child birth, that Caucasians would be materialists and run the earth materially; that Shemites would be spiritualists and would create every major religion in the world; that the seasons would continue till Revelation 20; that

Negroes would serve Caucasians and Shemites; that God would bless nations who took care of Abraham's PHYSICAL SEED, and that Abraham's spiritual seed would be VIRGIN BORN (Gen. 3:15; Gal. 3:16, 17).

All modern progress has to be a reaction against one Book. It is written in English. English is the universal language of the twentieth century.

You see, the English Book was one hundred times more powerful than any Christian intellectual or any Christian "scholar" thought it was. It controls the mental processes and activities of every scholar (lost or saved) on this earth. Check the birth and death dates of the scholars and see how many "pop up" after 1611. There are fifty times as many after 1611 as there were in sixteen centuries preceding 1600.

Every modern progressive movement in science, education, communications, transportation, electronics, physics, chemistry, and government is an attempt to prove that Moses and Jesus Christ were *liars* (see Mark 13:19 for example). The AV sets things in motion. No "scholar" does anything. No scholars were needed; everyone of them was absolutely *superfluous*. Women's Lib, Gay Lib, Affirmative Action, the UN, Detente, the Federal Reserve, paper money, air conditioning, travel by air, outer space explorations, electric houses, computers, college degrees, scholarly researches, relativity, theories on space and time, genetic manipulations, "no-fault" divorces, "no-fault" accidents, race-mixing, secular humanism, etc., are nothing but attempts to prove that the Biblical picture of man and the future of civilization—negative—is FALSE.

The scholarly reaction of the true "intellectual" to absolute truth is *emotional panic*. This is the driving force—the motivation—behind modern scientific "advancement." It has also been the driving force and motivation behind every revision of the English Bible, by anyone, since 1880. "Scholarship" was a gooney bird brought in from a zoo in Disneyworld to get your money (\$\$\$). The scholars were in a panic; a regular "conniption fit" of spasmodic twitches.

"Let God be true, but every man a liar."

You get along in here, and then the Bible-rejecting, "short-

sighted fools" (saved as well as lost) start this stuff about, "Well, would you have us go back to the horse and buggy and the washtub?" Well, it might lower your traffic fatalities about thirty thousand a year, and it might take fifty dollars a month off your time payments. "What about the miracle drugs?" They can't cure any disease (Alzheimer's, Brite's, Hodgekin's, AIDS, etc.) if God wants you dead. "Well, what about...?" *You mean what about Genesis 3:1 don't you?* "What about air travel? Think how fast you can get where you're going!" Yeah, and you can kill 100,000 people at one time now with a bomb. "Yes, but what about modern medicine?" Well, you can't cure a cold, or fix a broken back, or a dead nerve. What about it? "But think of the pain killers and...." You mean if you have enough real estate to sell *in order to pay the bill*? If you had such "love and compassion" on the "poor blacks" in "Apartheid South Africa," why did you destroy their economic system so they couldn't afford pain-killing drugs? "But we don't believe in Apartheid." You don't? Then why can't the Japanese and Chinese take over America and Europe? Any idiot knows Shem outnumbers Japheth four-to-one. "But look at the progress made in America in civil rights!" You mean if you qualify for a job you can't get it, because you are the wrong color? Do you mean a divorce rate of one out of two marriages because the women "got their rights"? What do you mean?

They don't know *what they mean. They never did.*

They gave Gorbachev "Hail Columbia" for treating Lithuania (1991) like Abraham Lincoln (1861) did South Carolina. They gave two Nobel Peace Prizes to two rioters who devoted their lives to overthrowing governments (see Rom. 13:1-6: all progress is reaction to a *King James Bible*). The press tried to disarm the American Public while reporting on disarmed Chinese (1990) getting slaughtered by their own government. They never did know what they were talking about, and they don't now. (See *The Prostitute Press, The Real Bigots, and Sex, Sin, and Satanism*. Three hour cassettes, Bible Baptist Bookstore, Pensacola, Florida.) Ignorance is bliss.

We are now ready to talk about *Biblical* scholars. We haven't discussed any yet. Emotionally disturbed saints who

abandoned the commandments given in 1 Corinthians 4:1-2; Acts 8:1; Colossians 3:1-3; 1 Thessalonians 5:21, and Ephesians 6:10-17, and spent the rest of their lives trying to get rid of other words in the Bible they didn't like, are not "Biblical scholars." (Take, for example, any member of any revision committee since 1880, plus anyone who recommended their scholarship, or accepted the recommendations of the men, or the schools, who taught them.)

Wanna sample four dozen of them at random to see if I am telling the truth? Do you think I overstated one item in the last paragraph or "slandered" anyone? Well, if you haven't researched the contents of the paragraph and "collated" the men mentioned, how do you know whether or not I misrepresented anybody, or was "given to overstatement" in anything I said? You don't. Your response was EMOTIONAL: there wasn't any intellectuality or rationale in it.

All right, on the NIV try Linton G. Duncan ("The NIV Style," *Christianity Today*, Sept. 28, 1973). No? How about Stephen W. Paine ("Why We Need Another Translation," *United Evangelical Action*, Oct. 1967). Like the same rubbish in another dumpster? All right, try Donald McKaid in "The Modern Idiom" (*Alliance Witness*, Dec. 5, 1973) or Pat Patterson ("A Careful New Translation" (*Christian Standard*, March 1979). Or how about this murky pot full of dead cats and rotten shrimp? "To Enjoy and to Trust" (Norvel Young, *Twentieth Century Christian*, March 1974). Are these men "godly" Christians? Why of course, man! There isn't an atheist or humanist in the lot: they just write *like that* and speak *like that* when faced with absolute truth. Do you think that Kenneth Barker ("An Insider Talks About the NIV," *Kindred Spirit*, Fall of 1978; pp. 7-9) has one thing to say that the other four gentlemen didn't say? Why they said just what Charles Scobie and Niel Lightfoot said about the TEV (*Good News Bible*: "Two Recent New Testament Texts and Translations," 1967 and "Two Recent Translations; a Study in Translating Principles, 1968).

They said: 1) Some good, some bad; some reliable, some not reliable. 2) Things are improving all the time, but nothing

is inspired and nothing is infallible. 3) I like this, you like that; they like them and those like these. 4) Go by my principles and you will get something trustworthy even if it isn't holy, or even if it is not the "scripture." 5) Anything is an improvement over the *King James Bible*.

"Short-sighted fools" from Elementary school through seminary.

What about the *New American Bible*? Well here are a "slew" of "godly" Christian scholars ready to "help folks out." Frederick Danker ("Review of the New American Bible, Catholic Biblical Quarterly, July 1971), L. Sabourin ("Review of the New American Bible," American Bible, *Biblic. Theological Bulletin*, July 1972), James Barr ("After Five Years: A Retrospect on Two Major Translations of the Bible, *Heythrop Journal*, Oct. 1974). And Claude Peifer, Bruce Metzger, Walter Harrelson, Edward Jackman, Richard Clifford, Robert Alden, and Gerard Sloyan. Any soul winners? *Not one in the bunch*. Anyone who could teach Bible in an interesting fashion below the twelfth grade level? *Not one in the bunch*. Not one man in the lot who knew half of what was known in 1929 by readers of Clarence Larkin and Ethelbert Bullinger.

Is there any paucity (oh *that's* a goody!) of "good, godly, Christian scholars" trying to sell you a Bible that denies the Deity of Christ in 1 Timothy 3:16 and Acts 4:27? No, the faculty at "doubly-separated" Bob Jones University are not the only "good, godly" scholars to pawn off this "weeny" on you. Here is the good Neo-Evangelical Theodore Epp right on the platform at BJU with "An Excellent Translation" (Good News Broadcaster, Jan. 1972) and with him is Louis Goldberg with "The Enduring Rock of Biblical Honesty" (*Moody Monthly*, Jan. 1972), coyly forgetting to tell you that "honesty" includes taking out the only commandment in the Bible to STUDY it (2 Tim. 2:15), obliterating the warning against "**science, falsely so called,**" and creating TWO Gods for the Jehovah Witnesses to worship (John 1:18, *NASV*). How "godly" can a "Rock of Honesty," be? The Lockman Foundation (trying to sell the slop) prints "NASB, Translation and Formal Facts," and Wilbur Smith says the *NASB* is "The Best of All the Recent Transla-

tions of the Bible" (*Moody Monthly*, July-Aug., 1964) If it is, you'd better buy Judge Rutherford's library and all of Pastor Russell's sermons. Nonetheless, Steven Barabas, Lorraine Bennett, Robert Bratcher, George Dolak, William Lane, Amin Panning, George Turner, Edwin Calverley, and Alan Culpepper all recommend a "Rock of Honesty" that lied on its *title cover*: it claimed to be superior to *all* translations for it claimed to be the *New American "Bible."* Did you get that? "NASB" instead of "NASV"? This was done to confine the Holy Bible to *AV* (a version) while crowning the *NASV* as a Bible superior to any "version."

This is "The Rock of Honesty," is it?

"You can't con a man unless he is crooked" (Dec. 1959, Paul Kirkindal, Blythesville, Arkansas: ex card shark, pitchman, professional gambler, and con-man.)

I overstated *nothing* when I said "any committee" or "anyone who recommended their scholarship" or "any of the schools that taught them." *New English Bible?* Try Henry Cadbury ("The New English Bible," *Theology Today*, July 1961). Now try Raymond Brown ("The Greek New Testament Being the Text Translated in the New English Bible," *Theological Studies*, Dec. 1964). Now try Raymond Brown Leonard Brockington ("The Hebrew Text of the Old Testament—The Readings Adopted by the Translators, Oxford, 1964). And then, just for variety, (not for learning, wisdom, holiness, knowledge, fruit-bearing, or understanding), try Cyrus Gordon, E. W. Hayden, Paul Davies, John McKenzie, Ian Moir, Gerald Kennedy ("The Preacher and the New English Bible," Oxford 1972), Sakae Kubo, Kenneth Rexroth, Dennis Nineham, C. M. Clerian, Arthur Gibson, and J. B. Hibbits.

What did they say?

1. Good here, bad there; excellent here, poor here; better here. 2. Nothing is inspired, nothing is infallible. 3. Scholars are working for YOU so you might understand the Bible better. 4. *Anything is an improvement on the King James Bible.*

Every man listed above (all fourty-five, and I have fourteen more I didn't list!) agree that *the scriptures* do not exist and that any translation is only a reasonable fascimilie, but that

THEY (the scholars) can tell you when a Bible is *like* the scripture and when it is *not*, having never seen the scriptures.

Do you think the RSV crowd is really any different than the *New English Bible* crowd or the NIV crowd or the NASV crowd? Then why don't you read the articles by J. Y. Campbell ("Review of the New Testament—RSV," *The Journal of Theological Studies*, Jan-April 1948); Kenneth Clark ("Theological Relevance of Textual Variation in Current Criticism of the Greek New Testament," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, March 1966); Gerald Knoff ("Catholic Edition of the RSV," *International Journal of Religious Education*, March 1967); Gerald Larue ("Another Chapter in the History of Bible Translation," *Journal of Bible and Religion*, Oct. 1963); Maclean Gilmour ("A New Textus Receptus?" *Christianity Today*, Sept. 26, 1960); and the books by Abdel Wentz ("The New Testament and the Word of God," in *An Introduction to the RSV of the New Testament*, Chicago, 1946; Oswald Allis, (*Revised Version or Revised Bible?*, Phil. 1953); and Millar Burrows (*Diligently Compared*, Thomas Nelson, 1964), or the one hundred-plus articles in more than thirty publications by William Amdt, Charles Drake, John Bowman, Arthur Katt, Neil Lightfoot, Arthur Gossip, A. F. Fergin, Theophile Meek, Joseph L. Lilly, G. A. Turner, Ralph Roy, John A. Scott, Dale Moody, Dane Orme, Frank P. Price, J. C. Fenton, Adam Fox, William A. Irwin, Kurt Hartmann, Sheldon Blank, A. R. Crabtree, and Cecily Raysor?

Want to know what they said? *I know what they said.* I have read what they said (plus twenty more just like them that I didn't take time to list): I know *exactly* what they said. I know the *sum total* of their intellectual output; the *combined strength* of their twenty thousand hours of "laboring in the word and doctrine" to bring you a "better and more up-to-date translation" of the "word of God." They said exactly what all of the promoters of the ASV, NASV, NKJV, NEB, TEV, RSV, NRSV, NASV, and NIV said. They said:

1. *We think this is the best.*
2. *Some people don't think it is the best.*
3. *Some people think it stinks, but they wouldn't dare say so in those words.*

4. It has strong points "here," but is *weak* "here."
5. It is doctrinally biased.
6. It is *not* doctrinally biased: you can find all the fundamentals in it.
7. Nothing is perfect; no Bible is infallible. *Anything is a step forward from the AV of 1611.*

Am I boring you? How can that be? I am citing the greatest Christian scholars, the greatest Christian brains, the greatest Christian intellects that ever backed up the greatest Christian scholarship of the twentieth century! According to Darwin, it has to be an improvement over the eighteenth and nineteenth century.

And the ASV of 1901? Well here are the hosts of hell again, in the name of "godly, recognized scholarship"—whose "loyalty to the word of God" is "unquestioned." C. E. Dobbs, "The Preferences of the American Revisers" (*Homiletic Review*, Feb. 1893). They preferred rotten eggs. Charles Ellicott, "Considerations on the Revision of the English Version of the New Testament" (Longmans Green, 1870), William M. Landdon, "Some Merits of the American Standard Bible," (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, July 1913), Matthew B. Riddle, "The American Revised Bible" (*Christian Standard*, Oct. 27, 1917), John Vander Ploeg, "American Standard Version Recommended" (*The Banner*, Oct. 12, 1956), Phillip Schaff, "The Revision of the English Version of the Holy Scriptures" (Harper and Bros., 1877). Not enough for you? All right, get the comments of David Wylie, Walter Specht, Clyde W. Votaw, Benjamin Warfield, James White, John A. Faulkner, Wayne Jackson, G. H. N. Luccock, and T. W. A. Chambers.

1. We did our best; ain't nobody perfect.
2. *This* is the best yet, but some folks don't think so.
3. This is from the wrong text, but *some folks* don't think so.
4. Weak here, strong here.
5. An improvement, but not perfect, of course.
6. *But anything is better than a King James Bible.*

I haven't given you the name of ONE Biblical scholar in the last *fifteen paragraphs*.

I have been listing destructive critics who made a living messing with a Book they didn't like and didn't believe. Every man I listed was a professing Christian.

"All the clowns are not in the circus."

Let's be honest, like the "Rock of Biblical Honesty"! Did I ever write anything about these translations? Yes, as a matter of fact I *did*. I am a tradesman like these gentlemen: a Bible teacher who uses reference material (see *How To Teach The Bible*, Lesson Two, 1990). I use thirty-two English translations, and seven foreign translations (Welch, Latin, Spanish, French, German, Hebrew, and Greek; the Greek is a translation of the Hebrew). Do you know what I said about the NIV (*An Indepth Study in Apostasy*, 1990)? I'm not in the Scholar's Union. I said it was about as near to NOTHING as you could purchase when buying print on paper between two book covers. Do you know what I said about the NASV (*Satan's Masterpiece, the NASV*, 1970)? I said it was as deadly a piece of heretical trash as was ever recommended by Bob Jones University, Wilbur Smith, and Theodore Epp. Can you guess what I said about the RSV and the NRSV? (There is nothing like "consistency" when it comes to being "honest," is there?) I said they were two of the deadest Dead Ducks that "Dead Duck Otherism" (as opposed to "King James Onlyism") ever produced; the products of genuine Communists who have been promoting Communism since 1908 (FCCC, now the NCCC). And about the "Living" Baloney? What did I say about Kenneth Taylor's "Dead Dodo"? (see *The Christian's Handbook of Biblical Scholarship*, p. 142). I said that any anti-intellectual, anti-scriptural, anti-rational, anti-Christian peddler who said that lunatics were epileptics (Matt. 4:24, 17:15), that no Christian was commanded to study the Bible (2 Tim. 2:15), that no one ever corrupted the Bible (2 Cor. 2:17), implied that sex perverts were just "unloving" (Rom. 1:31), that young women can get drunk (Titus 2:4), that none of the children of Israel who left Egypt got into the Promised Land (Heb. 3:16), that Peter was in Rome, Italy (1 Pet. 5), and that James did *not* write an epistle "to the twelve tribes" of Israel wasn't worth ten German marks in 1933.

Booksellers are not Biblical scholars.

Advertising agencies and *salesmen* are not Biblical scholars. "Bible" publishers and bookbinders are not Biblical scholars.

Hack writers and *trucklers* are not Biblical scholars.

No man on earth who knew the *contents* of the Bible would recommend one piece of trash written by any committeeman listed in the last twenty paragraphs. They themselves are exempt since none of them know the contents of the BIBLE. They don't know it for the simple reason that all of them deny that such a thing as THE BIBLE even exists. They all confess they have never seen it or read it (see *The Last Grenade*, pp. 113-116). And mind you, after this, they put the word "BIBLE" on the end of their commercialized propaganda (*NAS Bible, The Living Bible*, etc.).

There is nothing like "HONESTY," is there?

In our examination of *Biblical* scholars we shall always keep in mind that any "Biblical" scholar who is not making a personal evangelistic effort to win sinners to Jesus Christ is following Christ afar off, with "bloody hands," and is guilty of the folly of a "short-sighted fool," and is probably a consummate LIAR on top of that.

CHAPTER SIX

A Handful Of Biblical Scholars

As we said before, a Bible commentator almost has to be a scholar, of some sort, in order to do anything but compose a mess. The trick is to find out the commentators who "set the pace" so that those who followed them didn't have a whole lot of work to do. *John Peter Lange* (1802-1884) is one of these: he was a Biblical scholar. Is it true that he was often a critic and not too bright when it came to prophecy. It is also true that he may have been a "short-sighted fool" when it came to obeying the scriptures. He wrote *A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures* (critical, doctrinal, and homiletical), and it went twenty-five volumes. I have read all twenty-five of them. In addition to this, he turned out *The History of the Apostolic Age*, *A System of Christian Dogmatics*, *A System of Theological Hermeneutics*, and *A System of Biblical Hermeneutics*. He was a pastor and had pastoral experience for many years. His works include hymns and poems, and his response to Christ and salvation is at least TEN times as personal as Phillip Schaff's, and twice as personal as Westcott and Hort's. As a "German Reformed" his soul winning efforts would have been little or nothing; German Reformed (as Swiss and Dutch Reformed and Christian Reformed) are all five-point Calvinists who leave "soul winning" up to God.

Adam Clarke (1762-1832) was a Biblical scholar. His commentary runs eight volumes and it took him forty-five years to write it. I read all eight volumes before 1952. In addition to this, he turned out a *Biographical Dictionary* of six volumes, and *The Memoirs of the Wesley Family*. Although he was a Methodist, Adam Clarke was more Biblical than John Peter Lange, Phillip Schaff, Hislop, or Dummelow. Clarke assisted

in preparing an Arabic Bible for the British and Foreign Missionary Society and was active in the Wesleyan Missionary Society. Clarke had a concern for lost souls. He preached to obtain conversions while teaching himself Hebrew and Arabic. He was a member of the Antiquarian Society, The Royal Geological Society of London, and a "fellow" of The Royal Asiatic Society. He was born in Ulster (Londonderry) and was definitely converted to Jesus Christ by faith. Although Clarke was slightly infected with German higher criticism and the "fables and follies" of his day, (Griesbach, Codex Alexandrinus, etc.) and not to sound on prophecy, Clarke was a deep researcher, a heavy thinker, a thorough Christian, and a voluminous writer.

Andrew R. Fausset (1821-1910) comes close to being a real Biblical scholar. He wrote *The Church and the World*, *The Englishman's Critical and Expository Cyclopaedia*, *The Signs of the Times*, *The Personal Antichrist*, *True Science Confirming Genesis, Prophecy and Sure Light*, and several others. His best work was in collaboration with Robert Jamieson (1802-1880) and David Brown (1803-1897). Unlike his collaborators (Brown was post-millennial), Fausset was pre-millennial (see his comments on Revelation in the *Standard Commentary*). Unfortunately, Fausset's higher Christian education cooked his brains a little so he often says "rather..." and then gives you the standard Alexandrian replacement for the King James text (see *The Bible Believer's Commentary on the Psalms*, 1991). Furthermore, Fausset is "skittish" about his pre-millennialism in parts of his comments on the Old Testament passages. But he is a researcher and a collator, and a good one.

As we approach 1880, the Biblical scholars begin to disappear. From 1880 to 1990 the emphasis is not on the study of the scriptures, the expounding of the scriptures, or the teaching and preaching of the scriptures. The emphasis in England, America, and Germany is on changing the scriptures (see *The Christian's Handbook of Biblical Scholarship*, 1990, pp. 127-148).

Now we are not going to "slight" anyone intentionally.

A lot of educated Bible teachers wrote some good books between 1850 and 1930. But face it; a "scholar" is a man who masters a subject by intensive research and collation through a period of years. The ability to translate after learning two or more languages is no sign of "scholarship" at all. That is simply "linguist ability." Many people in Switzerland with a high school education can speak three different languages; they are NOT scholars. Somewhere down the line, the Alexandrian Cult has taught Christians that if a man masters Hebrew and/or Greek that this automatically transforms him into a "Biblical" scholar. Not by a ton-full, friend. There are unsaved Jewish Rabbis who know more Hebrew than Robert Dick Wilson or Doug Kutilek know, and they couldn't understand three-fourths of their own scriptures. There are native Greek-speaking Greeks who know more Greek than Stewart Custer or Gary Hudson will master in a lifetime, and they are just as good as in Hell with the door shut and the key thrown away. Someone has sold the Christians another "bill of goods." Linguistic ability is not found in the Wisdom Books (Job-Song of Sol.) as a requirement for learning *anything*. "All the treasures of wisdom and knowledge" are not found in grammars, lexicons, dictionaries, and "Word Studies. Robertson's *Word Studies* and Kenneth Wuest's *Greek Nuggets* are a varied assortment of clinkers that would do nothing for a Bible student but inculcate unbelief and confusion regarding dispensational truths, and loss of chain references to material the Greek scholar couldn't find.

Cyrus I. Scofield (1843-1921) was not an outstanding "scholar," but he certainly was a real Biblical *student*, and a good one. In addition to that, he was a MAN, which is a qualification notably absent from modern, fundamental scholarly circles. He fought for the South in the Civil War and received the Confederate Cross of Honor. He was a member of the Kansas House of Representatives and was appointed as U S. Attorney for Kansas by President (General) Grant. He was roundly and soundly converted, beyond any shadow of a doubt, and his conversion testimony stands by the testimonies of such characters as Aland, Metzger, Nida, Nestle, and Caspar Gregory like Mt. Everest standing by Mt. Whitney, Mt. Blanc, Mt. Mitchell and

the Matterhorn. Scofield was a pastor and a soul-winner, and he edited *The Scofield Reference Bible*, which is still the best reference Bible available. Scofield, as Bullinger, had enough sense to print the right Biblical text even if the Scholar's Union talked him out of his Biblical heritage in Genesis 1:6, 7, 16, 17, 6:1-3; John 3:5; Romans 8:1, and a few other places.

But, by far the greatest Biblical scholar the world has seen, since 1800, was a man that Elgin Moyer would not list in *Who's Who in Church History*. This scholar actually studied the BIBLE. He got what he got studying a *King James Bible* and his work became the definitive work for prophesy and prediction for EVERY pre-millennialist that showed up after his work was published (1929). This man was a converted draftsman who left the Episcopal church on his conversion and became a Baptist; his name was *Clarence Larkin*. Clarence Larkin (1860-1929) is the granddaddy of all the pre-millennial expositors, teachers, pastors, radio preachers, writers, and professors from 1930 to 1992. Not one man—Dwight Pentecost, Webber, Lindsay, Kirban, Rockwood, Newell, Dake, et al.—could go an inch beyond Larkin when it came to prophesy.

Larkin was definitive, he did the "leg work" for every prophetic expositor who followed him. Completely ignoring Heisenberg's "uncertainty principle," Laplace's laws of "probability," and Hawking's inability to "predict with certainty," Larkin laid out one hundred future events in order with the details of twenty of them given down to the last farthing. Among these were the return of Israel to Palestine (they had not returned when he wrote), the restoration of the literal throne of David to Jesus Christ, the rebuilt temple, the Judgment Seat of Christ (with the rewards), the Rapture (with a post-tribulation Rapture distinguished from a pre-tribulation Rapture), the coming of the Man of Sin, his conversion to the "Son of Perdition," the events of Daniel's Seventieth Week, the nature of the Advent and the judgment of the nations, the world-wide religious apostasy preceding the Tribulation, the plagues in the Tribulation, etc. Building on Bullinger, Peters, Darby, and Scofield, Larkin produced a conservative, Biblical type of Dispensationalism which has proved to be sound for over half a cen-

ture. Larkin knew things about the CONTENTS of the Old Testament that remained completely hidden to every Hebrew scholar and every Hebrew teacher on this earth. If a man has Larkin's *Dispensational Truth*, *The Spirit World*, and *Rightly Dividing the Word*, he is, at the start, better prepared to teach the Bible than any Ph.D. with a major in Greek Grammar who doesn't believe the *Authorized Version* is the Holy Scriptures.

What Donald Gray Barnhouse (1895-1960) knew about premillennialism he got from Clarence Larkin, and that goes for R. G. Lee (1886-1979), William B. Riley (1861-1947), Harry Ironsides (1876-1965), and Lewis Sperry Chafer (1871-1952).

Scholars (real scholars) have always been few and far between, with most of the modern Bible teachers getting by as "scholars," because they can handle Trench's *Synonyms*, Wuest's *Word Studies*, or the *Theological Dictionary* (Kittel). When you pick up a university catalogue and examine the faculty and staff you are always under the impression that you are looking at the photos of scholars. This illusion is created by listing "earned degrees," and places of "resident study" and staff positions on various colleges. But, ninety-eight percent of these are not scholars; they are *professional liars* who make a living telling the fourteen lies you will find listed in *The Christian's Handbook of Biblical Scholarship*, pp. 149-189. It would be safe to say that out of five thousand professors in the secular colleges in America and one thousand "Christian" professors in Christian schools, there are not FOUR Biblical scholars, and not even TEN scholars of any kind. What we have is six thousand professional tradesmen who know the terminology of their trade (see *The Damnation of a Nation*, Chapter 2).

Ethelbert Bullinger (not listed in Moyer's *Who's Who in Church History*) was a Biblical scholar. His learning and grasp of history, archaeology, foreign languages, figures of speech, Hebrew and Greek, Coptic and Syriac, Arabic and Persian, was as good as (or superior to) any unsaved Orientalist or any unsaved ancient historian the world ever produced. His 198 appendices in *The Companion Bible* take the student into fields dealing with chronology, genealogies, textual discrepancies, order of events, dispensational truths and "problem texts," that

he could find nowhere on this earth. Unfortunately, higher education cooked Bullinger's brain so he wound up as a five-point Calvinist with leanings towards universal salvation. "The bigger the belfry, the more room for the bats."

Bullinger couldn't win anyone to Christ, because all the "elect" would be won without his help or interference. (That is why the Trinitarian Bible Society of London, England today has been as limited as it has in evangelizing the world. They remained sound on THE BOOK but they are all guilty of the "folly of a short-sighted fool") Bullinger, as Scofield, had enough sense to print the right Biblical text in his *Companion Bible*. True, he suggests inserting his "ellipses" in four dozen places where he thinks the *King James'* translators "muffed it," and true, he suggests changes in the AV text in his marginal notes about twenty times per chapter, *but he did print the right scriptural text: the Holy Bible of the Protestant Reformation.* Bullinger has five crosses instead of three, two triumphal entries instead of one, and nine denials by Simon Peter instead of three. (This came from "dividing the word of truth" until all he had left was a pile of splinters. His chronology also differs from Usher's (after David's time) by over one hundred years.)

Now what about Russell Conwell (1843-1925), William J. Bryant (1860-1925), David Cook (1850-1927), Rudolph Kittel (1853-1929), Theodor Zahn (1838-1933), Henry Vedder (an historian), Seeberg (an historian), and Cadman, Julicher, Deissmann, Beiderwolf, Petrie, et al? No *Biblical* scholars. Not one in the car load. Adolf Deissmann (1866-1937)—actually "Gustav"—was a German Lutheran whose scholarship was as "unquestioned" as that of Phillip Schaff's or Konstantin Tischendorf's scholarship. Deissmann (*Light from the Ancient East*, Baker Book House, 1965) "illustrates the New Testament by recently discovered texts in the Graeco-Roman world." Naturally, his investigations were hailed as a "revolution" (see Hawking, Chapters 2, 8) and as "new light" (same old "Dead Sea" garbage) on the Bible. Deissmann couldn't understand either Testament before, or after, he wrote six hundred pages with eleven appendices and five indexes. He believed in a

mythological Septuagint that never existed, and there is no evidence that he even believed in the Deity of Christ or salvation by grace. He mentions studying the Greek Bible for fifteen years (p. xvi). "If you have ancient texts to decipher, the sunbeam will bring stone and potsherd to SPEECH. If you have been found worthy to study the sacred scriptures [no reference to any Bible anywhere] the sunbeam will REANIMATE the apostles and evangelists [i.e. they are dead], will bring out with greater distinctness the august figure of the Redeemer [His name is not mentioned] from the East, Him whom the Church is bound to reverence and obey" (p. xv). Deissmann, a sprinkled German Lutheran, never gave any evidence of conversion. He studied about the "religion of Jesus" and was an ecumenical worker all his life for reuniting with Rome. Ditto Philip Schaff.

Deissmann's claim to fame was that he "demythologized" a long tradition—that the New Testament was in scholarly or "heavenly" language; it was actually written in street language. This "revolutionary discovery" went unnoticed by Sam Jones, Dwight L. Moody, William Booth, Billy Sunday, J. Frank Norris, and Gypsy Smith (and all their converts) who had been using nothing but STREET LANGUAGE all their lives to preach the Bible. While they were leading literally millions of souls to Christ with an English Bible, Deissmann was proving to his own crowd that a Greek (now a dead language) Bible should be "re-examined."

Those scholars who were stupid enough to spend their time on that project, produced the three most corrupt English versions that ever put young preachers out of the ministry (the RV of 1884, the ASV of 1901, and Taylor's mess in 1966). Deissmann's "monumental research" did nothing but confirm a few idiots in their conceits while it shook other idiots up and made them abandon one theory and adopt another one—neither theory produced *anything* but three more generations of barren, fruitless, powerless, backsliders who followed Christ "afar off" with "bloody hands."

Par for the course.

The great "scientific discovery" that Deissmann made, which "shook the world of Biblical scholarship to the founda-

tions," and opened up whole "new areas and vistas of research" for man to "get a better understanding of the scriptures," etc., was the ALIBI given for one hundred perversions of the Holy Bible between 1880 and 1990: literally, one hundred. Using Deissmann as an excuse to convert the "mystical" language of the Elizabethan Age into "twentieth century koine" (that was Deissmann's thesis), *The New English Bible* (1960) has Achsah (the daughter of Caleb) "breaking wind" when she gets off of her "ass." (The stupid blasphemer, C. H. Dodd, was trying to put Deissmann into practice.) Kenneth Taylor (following suit) had Baal sitting on a toilet and Saul calling his son a "son of a bitch" in the "Living"—can you imagine it—"Bible." The *NIV* is stuffed with these ridiculous applications of Deissmann's "monumental discovery." The fools who suddenly found they could "understand the Bible" by reading this pulp literature (see *The Last Grenade*, pp. 105-108) panned out as the dumbest generation of Bible ignoramus America has seen since the Declaration of Independence. They did not become witnesses, they did not produce soul winners, they did not preach on the street, they did not lead adults to Christ, they did not oppose Rome, they did not emphasize foreign missions, and they could not understand the *first principles* (Heb. 6:1-2) of "rightly dividing the word of truth." **"By their fruits ye shall know them."**

The fruits of "Deissmannism" was three generations of Bible dumbbells who thought that "updating" the Holy Bible one hundred times in one hundred years—once every year would help them grasp the contents of the scriptures.

There is something about higher education (secular or sacred, Catholic or Protestant, Fundamental or Liberal, Conservative or Evangelical) that tends to produce "short-sighted fools."

Now we have about drained the barrel. The professors at BJU are not *Biblical* scholars, the professors at Maranatha and Cedarville are not *Biblical* scholars. Everything that they know (that is so) at Louisville Theological Seminary and Dallas Theological Seminary was in print before 1930. The same may be said of BBC, Pensacola Christian College, Maranatha, Ten-

nessee Temple, and Wheaton, Cedarville, Moody, Fuller, Pillsbury, and Piedmont. They do NOT study the Bible because they believe it; they do NOT study the Bible to find truth in it; and they do NOT search (research) the scriptures for the purpose of propagating the truth, edifying the saints, glorifying God, or converting the lost. They study criticisms and corrections of the Holy Bible in order to *establish their own authority over the student*. They never get any "new light" on anything, and what little light they have was given to them by scholars who *study the King James text* (Adam Clarke, John Peter Lange, James M. Gray, Clarence Larkin) or *printed the King James text* (C. I. Scofield, Fennis J. Dake, Ethelbert Bullinger). There are some good "encyclopediasts" among the fundamental premillennialists, who often write "helpful" books that are political or educational "eye-openers" (Tim LaHaye, for example, or Francis Schaeffer). Josh McDowell is a good researcher, and so are most of the "Creation-Research" writers connected with Henry Morris. A. E. Wilder Smith is unquestionably a scholar of the highest rank (*Man, His Origin, His Destiny*), and his critique of the 280 monkey men we talked about in Chapters 1 and 2 is flawless scholarship. I don't know if Smith ever led a man to Christ in a lifetime.

Now review for a moment. We are not talking about great missionaries and pastors and evangelists who left written works or who published multiple articles in line with their works. We are talking about Bible SCHOLARS: *Biblical* scholarship.

R. A. Torrey (1856-1928) was a teacher and a pastor and even though his studies in Germany (Erlangen and Leipzig) reduced his effectiveness as a minister about thirty percent, he still led people to Christ and wrote a little. He was not a "scholar" anymore than John R. Rice or W. B. Riley. James M. Gray (1851-1935) was a teacher, Bible institute dean, and for a while an Episcopal pastor. He was not a "scholar" in the real sense of the word. He wrote about twenty books and five excellent hymns. There is no doubt about his salvation or his missionary zeal. He was not only a successful pastor and church builder, but an interesting Bible teacher and a good administrator. A "scholar" he was not. It probably explains why

he was a good *pastor* and *Bible teacher* and kept his burden for missions. He wrote *What Did He Do?* and *Lord Send a Revival* (hymns), plus *How to Master the English Bible*, *Synthetic Bible Studies*, *Primes of Faith*, *Textbook on Prophecy*, *Why A Christian Cannot Be An Evolutionist*, *Spiritism and the Fallen Angels*, and *Great Epochs of Sacred History* Phillip Schaff would have done well to sit at the feet of James M. Gray from 1883 to 1893 instead of messing around with Westcott and Hort, preparatory to destroying the minds of five thousand young preachers in America (1901-1931) with the ASV. Gray new more about the *content* of the scripture at fifty than Schaff did at seventy, at least ten times as much.

Another rare Biblical scholar was *Arno C. Gaebelin* (1861-1945). A converted German who came to America and served in pastorates in Baltimore, New York, and Hoboken, New Jersey. He had a burden for Jews, and his writing was prolific. He was given a D.D. by Wheaton College. His *Annotated Bible* runs nine volumes and he wrote *The Jewish Question*, *Prophecy in Daniel (Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Zechariah)*, *The Conflict of the Ages*, *The Hope of the Ages*, and many others. He was dispensational and pre-millennial, although subject to pressure from the Alexandrian Cult at certain points. When he was not lecturing to intellectuals in conferences, he was "a courageous, bold, and dynamic PREACHER." Kenyon, Zuntz, Nestle, Aland, Metzger, Green, Schaff, Nicoll, Rendall, Kilpatrick, Colwell, Metzger, and Zane Hodges are not "in the running" with Arno Gaebelin. They aren't on the same race track with him. They are not even in the "lists."

John Nelson Darby (1800-1882) was somewhat of a scholar and he was an intensive STUDENT of the word of God. He translated the New Testament into both German and French and wrote voluminously on a wide range of subjects. He corrected the Bible quite frequently, and so God never used either of his translations in either country where they were distributed. God cancelled Darby with *Segond* and *Olivetian* in France, and cancelled Darby with *Luther* in Germany. Darby's dispensationalism was the basis on which the "Plymouth Brethren" were founded. Their charter was the words of Pastor Robinson of

the Mayflower (see *The History of the New Testament Church*, Vol. II, p. 30), and they were correct: *advanced revelation* did not *stop* with the Reformers, let alone with Origen, Augustine, or Wycliffe.

Fennis J. Dake (contemporary) worked for fifty years to produce an *Annotated Bible*. It has 500,000 cross references, eight thousand outlines, and thirty-five thousand notes and comments. Although it is ninety percent Larkin (and Charismatic on top of that), it does have the right Biblical text (*AV* and is far superior to any work produced by Schaff, Burgon, Hort, Robertson, Wuest, or Nicoll). Dake was a "Biblical" scholar.

"SHHH, DEAR!
HE JUST FOUND
SOMETHING
HE DIDN'T KNOW
WAS THERE!"

WHAT'S WRONG
WITH THAT MAN,
MOMMY?



NEUTRON - N
QUARK - Q
GRAVITY - G
NEWTON - N
CURVE - C
PARTICLE - P
QUANTUM - Q
MATTER - M
MAGNETIC - M
MILK - M
LEPTON - L
MESON - M
BARVONS - B
BARF - B



THE SCIENTIFIC "INDUCTIVE" METHOD

"O DAGON. HEAR US!
GRANT US THY POWER
TO REIGN ON EARTH!"




DO YOU REMEMBER WHAT HAPPENED IN I SAMUEL 5?



“LET’S DON’T QUIBBLE ABOUT “SEMANTICS”

"IS THERE A GOD?
CAN I FIND HIM?
DID HE EVER SAY ANYTHING?
WHAT DID HE SAY?
IS THERE REAL LIFE AFTER DEATH?
WHERE WILL I GO WHEN I DIE?"



N
N
N
N
N
N
C
C
C
C
C
C
K
K
K
K
K
K
F
F
F
F
F
F
S
S
S
S
S
S

1.0 350

BUILT BY A.T. and T. PRICE \$800,000,000,000

"NOBODY CAN KNOW FOR SURE"

CHAPTER SEVEN

Christian Tradesmen With Bloody Hands

I have never professed to be a "scholar" of any sorts. I do not consider myself to be an intellectual or even particularly "bright." I did have these thoughts many, many years ago as a young man, coming up through the public school system (now the federal jungle), and with an IQ of 150 (about 1944 A.D.), and the ability to read 600-700 words a minute, I may, at times, have fancied myself as a "thinker," like Zeno, Suzuki, Leucippus, Heraclitus, Kagawa, or Brunner. If I had gone on in that vein I would have accumulated enough "credentials" to convince myself (and perhaps several thousand more) that I was "scholarly." I could have added to my reading of the *Harvard Five Foot Shelf* and most of the *Encyclopedia Britannica* (see *The Full Cup*, 1991), ninety-five published works, including more than 7500 pages of Bible commentaries and four College-level textbooks, plus experience teaching twenty-six different courses, four of them on the graduate level of a seminary. An additional 123 times through the Bible would probably count for something. But on the fourteenth of March, 1949, I met the One "in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." I have never been the same man since.

For the first time in my life ("The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom") I began to actually THINK. Up till then it had been theorizing and day dreaming in a sort of psychedelic tunnel filled with hallucinations, fox-fire, illusions, dead ends, false starts, mirages, wet fuses, short rounds, duds, vapor, hot air, deceit, and out-and-out lies. From that day (March 14th, 1949) to this day (July, 1991), I have majored in *testing out the scholarship and intellectuality of the intellectuals who kept me in total darkness for twenty-seven years*, and

robbed me of the best years of a young man's life. I know *now* who all of these men are. At least two hundred of them turned out to be *professing Christians*, and at least forty of these were "godly," militant Fundamentalists" who spent their time trying to impress people with "infallible, verbal, plenary inspired originals" that no man on earth had ever even *looked at*

It was not till *after* I was saved that I found the forty "godly" militant boys, but there they were, right in with the pre-1949 evolutionists, atheists, agnostics, Satanists, humanists, and "relativists" I recognized their compatriots as soon as I ran into them: they all took the same *approach* to the Book that got me saved and into the ministry. They all quoted *human authorities* to get rid of it, or nullify it. They all had *college educations*. They all followed men and worshipped "scholarship." They all ridiculed (or slighted) the *King James* text. They all used one authority to cancel another one so that *they* could be the final authority. They all reduced anyone's faith in the Book if that "someone" believed them or trusted *them*. They all used terminology found nowhere in *any* Bible, and all of them were anxious for people to know that they were smart enough to correct the Book by which I was saved and called to preach. In these eight respects, Origen, Karl Marx, Bob Jones Jr., Darwin, A. T. Robertson, Kenneth Wuest, Trench, Rendall, Schaff, Jim Jones, Freud, Huxley, Wilbur Smith, Tom Paine, James Combs, Voltaire, Hobbes, Hume, James Price, Robert Sumner, and Dean Luther Weigle were all in the same boat, sailing the same direction, with the same captain: SATAN.

Salvation, for me, was first salvation from self (self-righteousness), then Hell (my just reward), and then from *intellectualism*. I was saved from "brains" like Pestalozzi, Giovanni Gentile, Madam Blavatsky, Emmett Fox, Emily Cady, John Locke, C. W. Leabeater, Astruc, Ingersoll, Paine, Rousseau (1712-1778), and Renan (1823-1892).

I was not "prejudiced" against intellectuals or intellectualism. I had ample time to study them *for years*; I had researched them confidently for years before I found out their true nature, goals, aims, motives, and "orientations." No snap judgments were made. (See the evidence in *The Full Cup*, an

autobiography, 1991). When I found the one **“in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge”** I had already developed an intense and deep suspicion of any man who pretended to be an “authority” on man, life, or death. By 1949, I was as skeptical of teachers and professors as Erich Maria Remarque (*All Quiet on the Western Front*). I was as skeptical of priests, popes, and bishops as Avro Manhattan or Paul Blanchard. Further, I was as skeptical of psychologists and psychiatrists as a farm woman in South Dakota. I was also as suspicious of doctors and lawyers as a Church of God evangelist. Being educated, I was suspicious of *anyone* who had any education. I had been tricked too many times. My approach, then, to Christian scholars and “Biblical scholarship” (1949) was not the approach of a bright, naive, innocent, young man opening his mind to all of the “brilliant discoveries” of “godly” scholars whose “fidelity to the word of God” was “unquestioned.” My approach was the approach of a junkyard dog smelling a fence line in *pitch black darkness* and questioning every sight, sound, smell, noise, movement, and atmospheric change in the area. I wanted to know:

1. Did the scholar believe in anything or anybody higher than *himself*? If so, WHO or WHAT?
2. Did the scholar have my best interests at heart, and was he really trying to help me get closer to God, or not?
3. What was the scholar's *motive* or *purpose* in taking the life course that he took and adopting the life work he adopted? Was this a Biblical course or work, as defined in the scripture?
4. What was the scholar trying to get me to *believe*, or *do*, when he presented his work to me?
5. Is the scholar habitually contradicting scripture in trying to prove his point, or is he deliberately replacing scripture with terms (and terminology) designed to overthrow some truth that is in the scripture?
6. What have been the *results* of the lives of individuals or groups (or churches or schools or nations) who adopted the point of view that the scholar presents?
7. What did the unsaved world think of this scholar, or

his work, in view of the fact that Jesus Christ said, **“that which is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God,”** and **“Marvel not, if the world hate you,...it hated me before it hated you.”**

Consciously or unconsciously (I don't know which), I had set up my own standard for examining Christian scholars. I was going to put them through some hurdles they hadn't even thought about. The silly children thought that all they had to do to “qualify” was exercise their intellects, collect their material, print their works, get their own kind to recommend them, and they would go down in my diary as truth seekers and truth finders. But I was going to judge them by another *Book*. The *Book* said: **“By their fruits ye shall know them. If they speak not according to this word it is because there is not light in them. Full well you make the word of God of none affect by your tradition. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools. The Lord knoweth the thoughts of the wise, that they are vanity. Men of high degree are a lie. The wisdom of this world is foolishness with God.”**

I took ONE STANDARD to be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the TRUTH, and then, I bet my life and my soul on it. You would be amazed at how it opened “new vistas” of understanding, and “revolutionized” my thinking so that “an embarrassment of riches” could be found, plus a “wealth of material,” giving me a “scientific breakthrough” into problems that bothered scientists for centuries. This “new light” from the seventeenth century (early seventeenth century at that!) “unlocked the secrets of the universe” to man's understanding so that.... (Just kiddin'. I thought I would talk like a scholar for a while.)

The Atlanta Journal, March 4, 1991.

“Biblical Scholars Rule Out 80% Of Jesus' Words”

“Virtually all of Jesus' words in the Gospel of John were voted down by *scholars* meeting in Sonoma, Cal., including John 3:16. Formed in part to counteract literalist views of the Bible, the Jesus Seminar—a 200 member group of mainline Biblical *scholars* from all over the USA—has stirred controversy since its first meetings, according to its founder Robert Funk,

New Testament *scholar* who has published widely...the *scholars* have met twice a year, basing their discussions on earlier *scholarship* and their own studies. Almost 200 *scholars* from universities and seminaries have participated. Mr. Funk contended that most mainline *scholars* agree with the Jesus Seminar. 'Most *scholars* if they had worked through the sayings, as we did, would tend to agree there is virtually nothing in the fourth Gospel that goes back to Jesus'."

See how it's done?

John's Gospel was written for the purpose of getting you SAVED (see John 20:31). Someone wants you *damned*. Do you know who it is? It is "Biblical" *scholars* who studied hard and have come to an agreement.

Kiss my foot.

I worked through those "sayings" myself 122 times in English and translated all of them using six Greek texts (Weiss, Nestle, Tischendorf, Hort, Von Soden, and the Receptus), and I never found one saying anywhere in the Gospel of John that Jesus said He *said*, that He didn't *say*. Just to make sure, I checked them out in TEN commentaries on the Book of John and then compared them with Valera in the Spanish, Segond in the French, Luther in the German, and Beza in the Latin.

Who are these "scholars"? Who cares? Who with an ounce of sense would give them a hearing if they were paid to sit and listen? I'll tell you who would: *a bunch of dimwits just like them*. Birds of a feather flock together.

Now I know that P. R. Ackroyd (University of London) and C. F. Evans (University of London) are "scholars." No one could have turned out *The Cambridge History of The Bible* (three volumes, Cambridge University Press, 1970) without being a scholar. "Christian" scholar? Who knows? I don't. "Biblical" scholar? Not on your linotype or word processor. Do they cite C. Brockelmann, J. B. Pritchard, H. Hunger, E. Posner, W. K. Simpson, C. H. Roberts, E. G. Turner, H. Von Campenhausen, W. G. Kummel, J. Hememann, J. Duplacy, S. Jellicoe, D. Barthelemy, S. Talmon, E. Wurtheim, G. Fohrer, J. Hayes, and K. Koch? Yes, they do. They also col-
lated the works of M. F. Berrouard, D. F. Wright, J. Danelou,

A. G. Martinmort, C. M. Martini, A. F. Klijn, A. L. Leloir, A. Geiger, G. W. H. Lampe, G. Vermes, M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, E. C. Colwell, and A. C. Sundberg. That is ONE-FIFTH of the Bibliography in *one volume*. Evans and Ackroyd can research; they can research and they can collate. They are "scholars." Were they "short-sighted fools" with bloody hands? They were, and so was every man whose name appears in the paragraph I just wrote.

From a *Biblical* standpoint, what did they accomplish with three volumes of seven hundred pages apiece? What was their motive to start with? What did they intend to do when they got the mess together? Was it to help you? Help you do *what*? Help you understand what? Was it so you would "know where your Bible came from"? Or "how we got our Bible"? There were more than one hundred works written on that before theirs came out. "But it is more complete and authoritative." To produce *WHAT*? Bible believers? Soul winners? Was anyone's faith restored in the Bible by reading this set of histories? *Name one*. Name one Christian on the face of this earth whose faith in the Holy Bible was so reinforced by *The Cambridge History of the Bible* that he threw himself into the teaching and preaching of the Book that sinners might be saved, and Christians might learn the *CONTENT* of the Holy Bible. You couldn't find a soul-winner in *The Cambridge History of the Bible* with a flashlight, laser beam, searchlight, telescope, microscope, and infra-red binoculars. Nothing in *The Cambridge History of the Bible* slowed down apostasy. Nothing in *The Cambridge History of the Bible* restored any sinner to fellowship with Jesus Christ. Nothing in *The Cambridge History of the Bible* told a sinner how to be saved. Nothing in *The Cambridge History of the Bible* could equip any sinner to know the first, basic, fundamental truths of either Testament. And, in *The Cambridge History of the Bible* there is no evidence of any kind that even *HALF* the writers for it were saved men.

Why then was it written?

For the same reason that *The Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* was written: so the professional tradesmen who didn't believe in any final authority could assist professional

tradesmen in their trade (\$\$\$), which was making a living by being connected with a Book *they did not believe*.

This would give them "standing," "class," and prestige in the eyes of lost and saved sinners alike—especially those in the Scholar's Union. Their motive was purely ADAMIC (not "academic"). There wasn't a Biblical verse in *any* version of the scripture that would justify it. There was not one "Christian" motive (taking Romans-Philemon to be definitive in these matters) involved from the *Preface to Volume One* to the *Index of References* in volume three.

The work was "wood, hay and stubble" (see I Cor. 3:10-15) from *The Table of Contents* in volume one to the *General Index* in volume three. If the New Testament is correct, *The Cambridge History of the Bible* is fuel for the Judgment Seat of Christ: it took over four hundred scholars and authors to compile it.

Every Alexandrian in the Scholar's Union would recommend the work as an outstanding achievement in the field of "Biblical scholarship."

I am no longer the greenhorn that I was back in the 1940's. You can't con this "dude" anymore. I can smell a PIOUS FAKIR five miles off upwind, and I can spot a WOLF in sheep's clothing ten miles away on a foggy day. When I got saved (at the age of twenty-seven) I began to THINK.

**"The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom.
Cease, my son, to hear the instruction that causeth
to err from the words of knowledge."**

I got some "new light" on things back in 1949; you bet your Florsheims I did, and I did not get it from one man who wrote for the *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, or *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, or *The Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, or *The Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* (Harris, Archer and Waltke), or Schaff's *History of the Christian Church*, or ANY man like any of the men who taught the men who contributed to those publications. When I turned on this new light, it shown not only on my own sinful condition—my wretched and lost estate—but on the world I lived

in, the schools I had been raised in, the religion of my parents, the books I had read, the future of this world, and the world to come, and the true NATURE of secular and sacred "scholarship." I got none of this light from any so-called "Biblical scholar" who had anything to do with the five publications I just mentioned. The man who led me to Jesus Christ had only a High School education (Hugh Pyle).

Do I know that Kenneth Scott Latourette is a scholar? Of course I do. I have used his twelve volumes on *The Expansion of Christianity* many times. He is not as careful a researcher on doctrines as Froom (*The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers*), but he only fails to research something if it is anti-Catholic or pre-millennial. Is Latourette a researcher and collater? Absolutely. His bibliography runs into well over eight hundred books, and his total output for describing "Christianity"—the term has little to do with the truths of the New Testament—is around six thousand pages. Do you know what you would "gather" after studying Latourette in detail (which I have for nearly forty years; even before he finished his last five volumes)? You would gather that the St. Bartholomew's Massacre was an unfortunate incident not worth describing: *which is a lie*; that Roman Catholic missionaries brought "the gospel" to South America and Mexico: *which they did not*; that the *RV* and *ASV* were improvements on the *AV*: *which they were not*; that at times, nations have "Christian impluses:" *which they have not*; that things are getting better as ecumenical procedures improve: *which is not so*; and that the European theologians who have been dying and going to Hell by the score since 1800 were "Biblical" scholars. *They weren't*.

Why, then, do I use Latourette? Because I am a tradesman. I make my living teaching Church History, among other things, and I *write* church histories (two volumes coming to over eight hundred pages). *Tradesmen need reference books to ply their trade.* (\$\$\$).

Got it yet? Do you know, yet, where you are and what you had better start doing? Are you going to remain a short-sighted fool all of your life?

Why do I have a hundred books in my office and home

library like Colwell's *Study of the Bible* (1937), Dodd's *Authority of the Bible* (1947), Peake's *The Bible, Its Origin, Its Significance and Its Abiding Worth* (1944) (Ah, there is one, baby! Ah, honey chil', there is one!), Cadbury's *The Making of Luke-Acts* (1927), *The Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers* (1956), Julius Brewer's *The Literature of the Old Testament* (1922), and Souter's *The Text and Canon of the New Testament* (1913)? Easy; *I am a tradesman*. I draw an income from teaching Manuscript Evidence, Advanced Theology, and Problem Texts. I need *equipment*. I get it from the tradesmen (\$\$\$). If the truth were known, their PURPOSE was to equip teachers like me for our work, but they never intended for me to use their equipment to get you to believe *A BOOK* was superior to their "trade" (\$\$\$).

Got it? *Are you ever going to get it?*

What do we get (from a true Biblical standpoint or "perspective") out of Kenyon's *Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (1912), Samuel Terrien's *History of the Interpretation of the Bible; Modern Period* (1933), Karl Barth's *Epistle to the Romans* (Der Romerbrief, Munich, 1923), Marvin Vincent's *History of the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (1958), Casper Gregory's *The Canon and Text of the New Testament* (1907), Robert Pfeiffer's *Introduction to the Old Testament* (1941), Ebhard Nestle's *Textual Criticism of the Greek New Testament* (1901), and Westcott's *A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament* (1896)?

We get the accumulated scholastic *trash* of four hundred *backslidden* professing Christians without one purpose in life but to *magnify their trade* (\$\$\$).

There is not ONE *soul winner* in the lot. There is not one *pastor* of a New Testament church in the lot. There is not one *man* on the crew who knew what a "revival" was, or ever even was *near* one when it took place. There was not ONE *wolf* in the flock of sheep who wrote ONE line that would confirm the absolute authority of the Holy Bible as the source of absolute truth for ANYONE.

Those works represent the life ministries of "short-sighted fools" who followed Christ afar off—if they knew Him at all.

They were not the "teachers" of Acts 13:1 They were not the "teachers" found in Ephesians 4:11. They did NOT "labor in the word and doctrine" (1 Tim. 5:17). They researched and collated to magnify a trade, the *trade* of the Alexandrian Cult (\$\$\$). Without the slightest bit of exaggeration, or the slightest overstatement of any kind, it will be found out by Christians at the Judgment Seat of Christ that anyone who was capable of reading ANY book listed above would have learned more about the Bible by studying Clarence Larkin's *Dispensational Truth* (1929) for one year than he could have learned sitting at the feet of Casper Gregory, Kenyon, A. T. Robertson, Colwell, and Eberhard Nestle for *ten years*.

What do the Alexandrians in the Scholar's Union say about Alexandrians in the Scholar's Union? Well, what do sinners say about those who love them (Matt 5:46)? "This volume is a distinguished achievement. Its *scholarship* (Ah, the magic word!) is sound and up to date." "Once again the contributors have produced a magnificent volume well worthy to stand alongside its predecessors." "An indispensable work of reference both for historical theology and for the history of *Biblical scholarship*." (Ah, the magic words!) "Altogether this is an excellent work; the author has obviously done his homework" (i.e. his conclusions match *ours*). "An indepth study, a true 'must' for every serious student of the word of God." "Judged by any standard (Yeah? Don't bet on it, kid 1 Cor. 3 is quite an exacting standard.) this work is a landmark in *Bible scholarship*." "Nowhere else can one find so comprehensive and *scholarly* treatment of a subject."

Why were these non-Biblical books written? What was the motive behind their composition and publication? To "help folks" do WHAT? To help folks understand WHAT, and WHY? Was this understanding necessary? Necessary to produce WHAT? Soul winners? Bible teachers? Street preachers? Missionaries? Purpose? Motive? Goal? Fruit? "By their fruits ye shall know them."

Do you want to know why I don't write like a "scholar"? Well, in the first place, I am *not* a scholar; and in the second place, scholars (as a class of people) are some of the dearest

people that ever got loose from a graveyard, and in the third place, it has been my observation that the guiding impulse that leads to research and collation (Prov. 18:1-3) is a desire to overthrow something God has said (see Chapter 6), or justify some sin that the New Testament puts its finger on. Oceanography and space exploration were the two alibies given in the New Testament for rejecting Jesus Christ. (If you don't know where these references are it is because you have been spending too much time in Kenneth Wuest's *Golden Nuggets from the Greek New Testament*, Spiros Zodhiates' *Hebrew-Greek Study Bible*, or A. T. Robertson's monumental *Greek Grammar*.) Paul said that intellectuals use research and collation to get around *believing* God and *obeying* Him. (And if you can't find that in 1 Corinthians it is because you have been wasting your time, and God's time, studying *The Expositor's Greek Testament* (edited by Nicoll) or Wilbur Smith's *Therefore Stand*.)

I am getting ready to "wind things up" (the expression came from 1611 [Acts 5:6] and is used on all three major TV networks in 1991, inspite of the fact that "winding things up" would now refer to a clock *starting to run*; not time *running out*.) By now, you should have guessed where we were going and why, and where we intend to wind up, and why. There have not been a dozen *Biblical* scholars on this earth since 1611, and the ones who take credit for it now are no more "Biblical" than D. A. Carson, Harold Lindsell, F. F. Bruce, Zane Hodges, Eugene Glassman, Arthur Farstad, James Price, Donald Waite, or Geddes McGregor (*The Bible in the Making*, 1959).

Cruden's MOTIVE for publishing his Concordance was to make it easy for a Bible student to find out what *the Bible* said about any given subject. He wasn't trying to aid someone in *criticizing* the Book. The AV translators were not trying to impress ANYONE with their intellects or their scholarship, and they were not interested in "sales charts" or the Stock Market (see Thomas Nelson's operations with the NIV and the NKJV). The fruits of the 1611 committee's work ("by their fruits ye shall know them") shows that Someone was bearing witness to their labors who was not interested in bearing witness to the labors of the Scholar's Union (1880-1990) for the next 320 years.

No amount of rubbish published by the Alexandrian Cult can fumigate them from the fetid miasma that lingers over their "vast, scholarly, "Christian" endeavors. *They stink*. They shine "like a dead mackerel in the moonlight," as someone has said. They say: "The *AV* translators did not profess to be inspired." (Neither did Samuel, Jonah, Matthew, Jude, James, or the authors of Ruth, Esther, and 1 Chronicles.) "The translators allowed for marginal notes." (So did you and you threw the wrong words into the margin.) "The translators had inferior manuscripts." (God did more with them than your "older and better manuscripts.") "Some of them believed in baby sprinkling." (Some of you believe that Hort was a scholar!) "The translators believed in a B.C. Septuagint." (All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God.")

They produced ONE BOOK which the Scholar's Union had to work on for 380 years—to get rid of.

They haven't gotten rid of it yet.

What were all of the *Biblical* scholars doing between 1611 and 1991? They were trying to replace ONE BOOK. That was the *motive* behind their "life works." Why? The Book would not let them alone. It was *alive*. It had the breath of God on it.

When I got saved (1949) I began to actually THINK.

I saw what these backslidden reprobates had been up to, and many of them were not even "backslidden," they were just poor, lost, hell-bound sinners who were top heavy from being educated beyond their intelligence. "The bigger the belfry, the more room for the bats." The Book was a thorn in their *intellectual flesh*. It was not "scholarly." It was not respectable. It didn't meet the "exacting demands" of their "high academic standards." That was the problem. One hundred thousand pages of hot air by four hundred hot air experts (1800-1990) was designed for one thing and one thing only: to equip a tradesman to destroy a young man's faith in *A BOOK*. His faith was to be transferred to the Scholar's Union and he was to look to *them* for the "final authority in all matters of faith and practise" (see *The Last Grenade*, pp. 325-342).

"One more time around the block, boys and girls!"

Here is *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*

(Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1939, 1956; original 1929). It is a neat, little, four volume work of over six thousand pages and consists of every major word in both Testaments given in English, Greek, and/or Hebrew located, defined, and applied with cross references and comments. The Bible chapters are in bold face print and the thoroughness of the work would be manifest to anyone. We take one example. The word "Egypt" occurs over 590 times in the Bible. Under "Egypt" you will find a detailed discussion of the *country* (climate, location, fauna, flora, conditions of life, archeological finds and topography); its *history* (pre-historic, 1st-2nd dynasties, 3rd-25th dynasties, etc.); its *Old Testament connections* (Abramic times, Exodus, the Ethiopians, Shishak, Zerakh, Tahphanes, Syene, etc.), and its *civilization* (language, writing, literature, foreign gods, laws, future life, etc.). This is nicely backed up by Baedeker, Morgan, Breasted, Murray, Erman, Wilkinson, Mahaffy, Milne, Petrie, and M. G. Kyle.

Was there a saved man in the lot?

Who knows? No "Christian" scholar or "Biblical scholar" researches such matters although they pretend to be "Biblical" and "Christian." ("Judge not lest ye be judged!")

What was the Encyclopedia written for? It contains the Graf Wellhausen theory as a fact, it denies that Israel crossed the Red Sea—so all the maps in the backs of your Bibles deny it (they followed "the qualified *Biblical* scholars"), and the article on Daniel (by Robert Dick Wilson—who could speak, read, and write more than forty foreign languages) is so inferior to Clarence Larkin's book on *Daniel* as to be a shame and a disgrace. Robert Dick's "higher education" bombed his mind out. The article on *The Epistle to the Hebrews* is so shallow a minnow couldn't swim in it. It was written by T. Rees, using Peake, Davidson, C. Edwards, Von Soden, Zahn, Harnack, W. Wrede, F. F. Bruce, Milligan (all the boys! Can you recognize any of them by now?), Moffat, Hoffmann, Westcott, and F. Rendall.

Do you know where "all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge" for the Book of Hebrews are to be found? I know. They are NEVER found in Peake, Zahn, Bullinger, Moffat,

Westcott, Nestle, Hort, Robertson, Zodhiates, Hollmann, Rendall, or *The Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* or *The Pulpit Commentary* or any combination of any Alexandrians who wrote ANYTHING.

James Orr was the editor of the *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*; he was assisted by four "doctors" who would put Gamaliel and Paul to shame; Drs. John Nuelson, Edgar Mullins, Morris Evans, and Melvin G. Kyle. Why did they put their omnibus together? To help Christians? *To help Christians do WHAT?* Do what they themselves had been doing all their lives? When the scriptures said: "Be ye followers of me, as I also am of Christ" was it saying "be ye followers of ORR, Nicoll, Schaff, Nuelsen, Mullins, Evans, Kyle, and Co.?" Motive? *Intent?* "The fire shall try every man's work, of what sort it is."

Surely these men weren't trying to get you to follow THEM!? What were they doing? Well, what was Einstein doing in 1905 when he wrote on "Relativity?" Well, what was Kant up to when he wrote *The Critique of Pure Reason*, or, for that matter, what did Hegel have in mind when he constructed his "Dialectic"? Get with it. What was Karl Marx *REALLY* thinking about when he wrote *Das Kapital*? Was he really trying to "make the world a better place to live in"? Did he do it? Did he accomplish his purpose? *Was that his purpose?* Motive? *Intent?* Fruits?

There isn't one scholar (to my knowledge) who edited *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* who ever led two sinners to Christ in a lifetime. (If you find one, write me and I will repent and rephrase this sentence. I like to be "exacting" in my "scholarship!" [Ho, ho, ho!].)

"Hit me again, Ah'm still breathin'!" (Black Jack, circa 1940).

Here is William Wonderly and Co. (citing *The American Anthropologist*, *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, *The Bible Translator*, *The International Journal of American Linguistics*, and *The Journal of Education Psychology*, and quoting Victor Yngve, William A. Stewart, Eugene Nida, Raven McDavid, Hans Kurath, Punya S. Ray, Charles A. Ferguson, Charles

Fries, Robert Bratcher, William Bright, and two dozen more). Man! what an authoritative, scholarly, intellectual, scientific "orientation!!" telling you how to put out *Bible Translations For Popular Use* (United Bible Society, N.Y., 1968).

What have we here? Well, here we have: "vertical dimension, socio-educational class, mutual-interest group, orthography, heterogeneous, situational bilingualism, pertussis, magneto, mantissa, digital computer, chronological dimension, readability formulas, figure ground distinction, figure ground dichotomy, foreground information, zero anaphora, structural ambiguity, front heaviness, embedding, content morphemes, detransforming nominalizations, and Chiasmus." Boy, ain't Higher Christian Education wonderful! Gee, just think of the *devotion* of these brilliant intellects to the task of putting *the Bible* into popular language! Boy, it must be wonderful to have an education. Man, I can trust THESE GUYS with my Bible, *surely*. Surely, they would be greater Biblical "scholars" than Larkin, Scofield, or that dog "Ruckman"!

Don't place your bets yet. Hang on to your chips.

"You see dat 'United Bible Society' a-settin up thar! Wal, bless mah soul, dahlin', dat am de Society what had:"

1. The Roman Catholic Bishop of Onitsha, Nigeria, as a vice-president, and the Archbishop of Canterbury as an "honorary president."

2. Catholic Bibles sent out all over the mission field containing the Apocrypha as *part* of the inspired Old Testament.

3. Catholic Bibles sent out all over the world with "study helps" in them. The "study helps" were to help pagans believe in the perpetual virginity of Mary, which is a lie; purgatory, which is a lie; a continued "sacrifice" after Calvary, which is a lie; the intercession of the saints, which is a lie; and the supremacy of a bachelor priesthood in Rome, which is also a lie.

4. The Rev. "Father" Alberto Ablondi on the European Reg. Exec. Committee: he is the *Roman Catholic* Bishop of Livorno, Italy (see *The Christian's Handbook of Biblical Scholarship*, pp. 62-63).

Does this sound like the Protestant Reformation?

Does it remind you of the work of John Knox, Dwight L.

Moody, General William Booth, George Whitefield, John Wesley, Charles G. Finney, Billy Sunday, or Sam Jones? What *does* it remind you of?

And what did the little doo-dads (content morphemes, magnetos, pertussises, figure ground dichotomies, etc.) produce?

"By their fruits ye shall know them."

They produced "a descendent of David" for "**the house of David**" in Luke 1:27, *destroying the link between Mary and the Davidic Covenant* (2 Sam. 7).

They produced "will make him a king" for "**the throne of his father David**" in Luke 1:32, *destroying all the references in both Testaments which identify David's throne as "the throne of His glory"*—the earthly throne of JESUS CHRIST, on this earth, at Jerusalem.

They produced "the Lord's power" instead of "**the hand of the Lord**" in Acts 11:21, thus erasing *all the chain references* to the Lord's "right hand" and "**the hand of the Lord**" in the Old Testament, and "**the good hand of God**" being on Ezra and Nehemiah.

They produced "for the sake of Christ" when the verse (Rom. 1:5) said "**for his name**" when they knew "Christ" wasn't anybody's name: "Christ" is a *title* ("Messiah" or "Anointed One"). (Wonderly, op cit., p. 123).

They were so highly educated, and so "godly motivated," and so intellectually equipped, and so "scientifically prepared" to help you poor, dumb people out with a "popular language" Bible, they forgot that His "NAME" was "**JESUS: for he shall save his people from their sins**" (Matt. 1:21). *They lost their marbles before they got into the second chapter in the New Testament.*

This is the twentieth century fundamental (Orthodox, Evangelical) "Biblical" scholarship in 1991, at its best.

Whatever these backsliders are proposing (or have been proposing since 1880), there is one thing that is certain: it isn't worth the time it would take you to read it, let alone study it. They are commercialized tradesmen involved in promoting their trade. There is not enough difference between them and the idol manufacturers at Ephesus (see Acts 19:25-28) to find out their

names, at least when it comes to finding the truth found in the living words of the Living God.

By now, don't you know what I am proposing? I am proposing ANTI-INTELLECTUALISM; a *retreat* from research and collation by a return to the living words of the Living God in a BOOK. I am proposing *revisionism* and "reactionarianism" (dig that word, honey!). I am proposing a *retreat* from "scientific discoveries" and "scientific breakthroughs"—a veritable *retrograde* to "mid-Victorian, Puritanical, Protestant ethic, Judeo-Christian tradition" in the "archaic Elizabethan terms" of a red-neck "hillbilly."

I am proposing an *Anti-Intellectual Manifesto* for every human being on this earth who has any brains left, or an ounce of common sense left anywhere in his makeup.

CHAPTER EIGHT

The Intellect of the “Anti-Intellectual”

His position has a certain amount of subjectivism in it just as all other positions taken by all intellectuals who profess to be “neutral” or “objective.” But this position is taken after observing the results and the fruits of the intellectuals in the Scholar’s Union through a period of twenty-four centuries (400 B.C. to 1990 A.D.). (Since we have written on this at length in *The Christian’s Handbook of Science and Philosophy* we will not review the ground again, here.) The fruits of Origen, Augustine, Jerome, the popes, Darwin, Huxley, the scholastics, Plato, Hegel, Kant, Spinoza, Descarte, Sarte, Einstein, Freud, Jung, Pavlov, DeWette, Nestle, Hort, Hawking, Hoyle, Laplace, Heisenberg, Oparin, Hobbes, Hume, Bernard Shaw, Russell, Dewey, Menninger, Schaff, and A. T. Robertson, etc., speak for themselves. *So does the work of the King James translators.* A list of Nobel science award winners and books on “Who’s Who in Science” will reveal who the “intellectuals” are. Not even the creationists and catastrophic geologists among them obeyed the main commands in the New Testament (Acts 1, 20:20-30; 2 Cor. 5-6; 1 Cor. 1-3). Every intellectual I listed since page 1 (saved or lost) was a short-sighted fool with bloody hands, if we take the BOOK as the standard of judging a man’s intellect, and that is exactly what we are going to do.

I. In *the Book*, mankind is revealed as *lost* and headed for judgment and Hell. Man must give a personal account of his life to a *personal Creator* and Judge, and then he will spend eternity enjoying that Creator’s presence (old Presbyterian catechisms) or spend it in a *Lake of Fire*.

There, that will do it. I just got rid of ninety-five percent of all the intellectuals who ever lived. In one swat I eliminated

every unsaved scholar from Ptolemy and Hammurabi to Hawking and Bertrand Russell. One swat. Those truths are found in Ephesians 2:1-4, John 17:24, Revelation 20:11-14, and 1 Corinthians 15:28. You don't have to move two inches in the BOOK to remove ninety-five percent of the intellectuals on the face of this earth from any connection with the word "BIBLICAL." If he were "Biblical" he would believe point I. One millimeter in that Book (the verses listed above make up less than one-thousandth of the Book), is worth thirty thousand miles in any other book.

II. If a scholar is saved, he knows point I is true whether any of his peers or mentors believe it or not. There is not on this earth such an animal as a *saved sinner* who doesn't know the DESTINY of men who reject the Biblical plan of salvation (see Prov. 24:10-12 for light on the cowardice of the faculties and staffs at Bob Jones, Tennessee Temple, Moody, Fuller, Liberty University, Wheaton, Dallas Theological Seminary, and Pensacola Christian College).

III. The "treasures of wisdom and knowledge" in the Bible are to be found in ONE MAN (Col. 2:3), and they are *hidden*. That Man said that you were to believe what Moses wrote (John 5), and if you *didn't*, you couldn't believe HIM (John 5:46, 47). That Man said that the words He spoke would judge YOU in the last day (John 12:48) and God confirmed His warning with a bodily resurrection (Acts 17:31). It is the SPIRIT (John 16:13) of that Man (John 16:7) who professes to be the ultimate SCHOLAR (1 Cor. 2:10) and TEACHER (John 14:26) because He is the "spirit of truth" whom the world cannot receive (John 14:17).

IV. If any scholar's teaching or preaching (or words, thoughts, precepts, principles, or doctrines) doesn't line up with the plain words (Prov. 8:8, 9) that were given by God (2 Pet. 1:18, 20) for men to hear and read (2 Tim. 3:15, 16), he is to be set aside as a plate of rotten shrimp (Prov. 19:27, 1 Tim. 1:13, Isa. 8:20, Rom. 3:1-6, 1 Cor. 2:4, Rom. 16:18).

V. Every Fundamentalist who claimed that "the Bible is the final authority by which all matters were to be judged" and then refused to allow that YOU had a copy of that Bible, is

nothing but a two-faced Nicolaitan out to make a fast buck. The words "BIBLE" and "BIBLICAL" have no connection at all with any intellectual (saved or lost) who has never *read the Bible, seen it, studied it, preached it, taught it, or believed it*. The correct word would be "copies," "copies of copies," "reliable translation," "trustworthy translation," or "reliable eclectic text." Thus the Biblical scholars would not be "Biblical" scholars at all. They would be "translation scholars," "eclectic copyists," or any other number of valueless and degrading terms that would deprive them of the distinction, recognition, and honour they demand among professing Christians.

VI. If the scriptures are correct, no scholar has any wisdom at all if he does not: 1) Fear God. 2) Depart from Evil. 3) Win souls to Christ. 4) Submit to the authority of the scriptures. 5) Have his affections set on invisible (2 Cor. 4:17-18), eternal things (Col. 3:1-3) in the Third Heaven (2 Cor. 12:1-6).

There! I eliminated three hundred "Biblical" scholars and two hundred "recognized authorities" in one more swat. God said He wouldn't even LOOK at a scholar who didn't tremble before His word (Isa. 66:1-2). Name *one scholar* anywhere in your state, or in any school mentioned in this book who "trembles" at the words of God (Isa. 66:2) like Josiah did (2 Chron. 34:18-21).

Now, if this subjective position is right, how do you suppose a pious Nicolaitan in the Scholar's Union would react if he actually was a saved man trying to justify his sin of "ministering" to young men by destroying their faith in the Book? Well, on point I he would say that "They were predestined to go either way" (if he were a Calvinist)—so that would relieve him of the obligation of doing personal work and preaching evangelistically—or else, that he was "called to teach," not to be a "preacher." What then would he TEACH his students to do, or become? Teachers? *Teachers to teach WHAT?* (See the pretty lettuce showing through the lattice (\$\$\$)? Peekaboo! I see you!)

II. Here, he would say, "Well I witness by writing, or I witness by being connected with an institution that believes

in witnessing," or "I don't believe you can win people to Christ by yelling at them or antagonizing them," or "How do you know I have not led anyone to Christ? Only God knows that!" There are all kinds of pious cover-ups for an apostate reprobate who is too yellow to tell a doctor, lawyer, or a physicist that he is going to Hell. The chicken feathers weren't all plucked when Demas went back to Rome (2 Tim. 4).

III. Here, the scholar would say, "Exactly! And it is our duty to find out what *those words* were! Because *we* know that those words were not the ones in the Protestant Bible of the English Reformation," and then, again, "Well why can't the Holy Spirit use us scholars to teach the truth? Evangelists and Bible teachers don't have any monopoly on the truth." Nineteen centuries of church history would appear that they *do*. Three hundred years of modern history (1611-1990) would show that if God ever said any WORDS to anyone they certainly were *not* the words the scholars are giving you out of Nestle's, Aland's, Metzger's, and Hort's "eclectic Greek New Testaments." (See *Church History*, op cit., Vol. I, Chapter 5, and Vol. II, Chapter 10).

IV. "But how do you know what God said? (**"Yes, hath God said?"**) And "How do you know what you *think* you know (Epistelmology)?" and "What makes you think you know more than men smarter than yourself?" (Psa. 119:99 for one thing.) And "How could men have had these plain words to read if it had not been for US SCHOLARS?" That's easy: *we got them in spite of "you scholars."* And we are going to *keep them* according to 2 Tim. 1:13, inspite of you "scholars."

V. You have no final authority if you have no *final authority*. If you have no final authority by which to judge others and YOURSELF, then *you* are your own final authority, and for all practical purposes, "God." If speed, time, and distances are all "relative to the observer"—ah, that is where the UNSAVED monkey man in the Scholar's Union got their tail in the Christian's tent!—then Biblical truth is *relative* to the critic who perverts it. Modern twentieth century Fundamental "Biblical scholarship" is carried on by a union of practical **ATHEISTS**. Not one Humanist in the New Age Movement could "hold a candle" to them.

VI. "Well this depends upon your interpretation of scripture. The word "fear" doesn't mean "fear," it means "godly reverence"; soul-winning is not found as such in either Testament, for the "soul" is not a separate part of man; the word "Nephesh" and "Psuche" actually mean....etc., etc.

Got it yet? Any progress?

"The word 'affection' in Colossians 3:2 shouldn't be *affection*; it is only the MIND that is involved (NKJV, NIV, ASV, NASV, etc.). "North" is a relative term, so when Paul is caught "up" (2 Cor. 12:1-4) we cannot say exactly where the...."

Got it yet? This comes from the "Biblical scholars" who put out the *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, *The Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, *The History of the Christian Church*, *The Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, *The Ante and Post Nicene Fathers*, *The Cross Reference Bible*, *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, and *A New Short Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, and passed off as "Biblical scholars" while they were doing it. They got the Congressional Medals without leaving the Regimental Bivouac Area. They earned the Silver Star while washing dishes in the Cooks' and Bakers' School. They were nothing but first class *hypocrites*, if they were saved, and if they were *not* saved you had no business consulting them for "the time of day," let alone for the meaning of any passage in the New Testament.

You couldn't trust them for the scriptural meaning of any scripture in the New Testament.

What did John Updike contribute to your knowledge of the Bible? You get one guess. What did Paul Tillich, Erich Fromm, Gustave Weigle, and David E. Roberts teach you about real Biblical "faith." Not one cotton-picking thing on the face of this earth. What lessons can you learn from history by listening to Reinhold Niebuhr, Rollo May, and Will Herberg? About as much as you would learn from Winston Churchill or Will Durant. Not enough to know about one thing going on in the world today. Want to learn about Sin, Evil, and Man? Well the last five men on God's earth who could tell you anything true about any of them would be E. La Cheronnier, Reinhold

Niebuhr, Erich Fromm, Paul Tillich, and Fyodor Dostoyevsky. There is more about "man," "sin," and "evil" in *one small book* in the middle of your Bible than in the *libraries* that Dostoyevsky, Fromm, Tillich, and Niebuhr used for their "research" in those subjects.

When Herberg, Tillich, Niebuhr, Erich Fank, Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Kim Malthe-Bruun, Martin Buber, James A. Pike, Karl Adam, and Dostoyevsky write on New Testament Salvation (*The Edge of Wisdom*, Robert Wicks, Charles Scribners, 1964) it is so tragic as to call for a twenty-one gun salute over a flag-draped coffin. You can find the plan of salvation given clearer in a Jack Chick or Ford Porter tract of ten pages than you can in the combined works of these "brilliant intellects."

Who were these confused, Bible-perverting nuts trying to play "theologian" and making a bigger mess than Camille made going through southern Mississippi (Aug. 1969)? Who are these confused, double-speaking, indecisive, blind guides? They are Professors of Applied Christianity at Union Theological Seminary, Ph.D.'s from Yale, Chairmen of the Department of Religion at Columbia University, Deans of the Cathedral of St. John the Divine, Russian novelists, *philosophers* who taught at Heidelberg and Harvard, Ph.D.'s from the University of Heidelberg, *professors of Psychology* at New York University, *graduate professors of Philosophy and Culture* at Drew University, Ph.D.'s from the New School for Social Research at New York, associate professor of *Ethics* at the Hartford Seminary Foundation, Ph.D.'s from Montpeiler University professors of *Philosophical Theology*, and Professors of *Theology* at Yale Divinity School.

Intellectuals all; the cream of the crop.

There was a crop failure everytime they opened their stupid mouths or picked up their stupid pens.

Not one ding-a-ling in the bunch could tell a sinner how to get saved. Not one Deist in the lot could explain Calvary as a blood atonement for the sins of sinners (*including himself*) and not one yo-yo in the lot had any more idea of what the Kingdom of God or the Kingdom of Heaven was in the scripture than Philip Mauro or Bob Jones IV. Paul Tillich's

understanding of New Testament salvation (op cit., pp. 197-198) is the understanding of a child of Hell, "dead in trespasses and sins," yet he prefaces his hopeless nonsense with a salute to Christ's Deity! "Doing the truth (*not believing any truth given in either Testament*) means living out of the *reality* which is He Who is the Truth, making His being the *being* of ourselves and of our world...the truth which LIBERATES is the truth in which we participate, which is a part of us and we a part of IT...we recognize IT wherever IT appears; we recognize IT as IT appears in ITS fulness in "THE CHRIST" (p. 198). Old Tillich, if the Book is right, is just as good as in Hell with the door locked and the key thrown away.

He was a great "Christian" theologian.

So was Buster Keaton.

So was Porky Pig.

MANIFESTO:

I. We anti-intellectuals resolve, first of all, that in view of the fact that the world's leading intellectuals (saved or lost) have proved time and time again that "the bigger the belfry, the more room there is for the bats," that we will not take any intellectual *seriously* (saved or lost) simply because he has twenty-five years of formal education, holds five earned degrees, can master *ten* languages, and has spent a *lifetime* investigating some scientific, economic, social, political, philosophical, religious, or Biblical subject. Before we take him seriously we will ask ourselves **THREE** questions about him:

1. Was he a *saved man* in the Body of Jesus Christ?
2. Did he subscribe to any authority *higher* than his own "scholarly" opinions and preferences?
3. What was his *motive* and *purpose* in taking up the line he adopted for a "life" work? When we know the answers to these questions we will apply Manifesto II.

II. Are the *conclusions* of his life work (his "thesis") in line with Romans-Philemon in the New Testament? Paul was the apostle to the Gentiles. If the scholar is a Gentile, Paul was sent to him (Rom. 15:16-19). Would the intellectual's "life work" help any Christian to be a better Christian? Would it give him a better understanding of his Saviour (Eph. 1:17-19) or the will of God for his life (Col. 1:9-10)? Would it equip him to be a more effective witness for Jesus Christ? Would it increase his faith in the Holy Bible or decrease it?

III. If I believed everything the "scholar" wrote, would I find myself in a position where I would have to deny something that Peter, James, Jude, John, Paul, Moses, et al. wrote? If I doubted what Peter, James, John, et al. wrote, could I believe

that this man was *right* and therefore could correct what I formerly *thought* Peter, James, John, et al., wrote? Using what standard? Why did he pick this particular standard to get rid of what I thought Peter, James, John, et al. wrote? What was his motive to start with? Was he really trying to help me? Motive? Intent? *Purpose*?

"Well, brother Ruckman, you know what the good Book says...**judge not lest ye be judged**. I mean, who are you to question any man's motives or purposes?"

Pious, aren't they? Just as clever and pious as Saul (1 Sam. 15:13) and Gehazi (2 Kings 5:25).

Well I happen to have a Book that can discern "**the thoughts and intents of the heart**." The scholars don't have this Book, but I do. I picked it up in 1949. It taught me how to THINK. It told me what words were (Prov. 25:11, 1:1-7, 2:1), how to *treat* words (Rom. 12:9), when to *believe* them (1 Thess. 2:13, Prov. 22:21, Deut. 18:18-19) how to *test* them (Jer. 23, Ezek. 14, Isa. 8:20), and which ones to *live by* (John 17:17, John 6:63), when to be *wary* of them (Rom. 16:18, Judg. 1:16), which ones to *throw out* (Matt. 12:34, Prov. 12:6, 30:6), and which ones to *preach* and *teach* to others (Phil. 2:16, 2 Tim. 4:1-6, Psa 138:2, 12:6, 7, Prov. 4:20, 8:8).

IV. We anti-intellectuals further resolve to dismiss as trivia and excess baggage any "scholarly work" that even *suggests* that evolution exists in ANY form in regards to any kind of life (organic or inorganic) anywhere in the universe. We assume this *religion* comes from a *diseased mind* that is obsessed with man's self-righteous faith in himself to improve himself, *apart from God*.

In essence, the theory of Evolution (as believed, applied, described, explained, or presented by *anyone*) is nothing but the unsaved sinner's fixed opinion that he is *improving* with age and there fore can work his way into heaven. And whether this "fig leaf factor" (see Gen. 3) is a long tortuous route through a thousand reincarnations (Buddhism, Hinduism, etc.) or Horace Mann's "Kindergarten to Paradise Restored" via the Public School Jungle, it is the same *self-righteousness* that showed up on Cain's altar. Huxley said that evolution should

be applied as the final authority in all matters of faith and practise not only to the physical sciences but to art, music, *religion*, society, and eventually law (*Encyclopedia Britannica*, Vol. 20). This explains why the District Court and Supreme Court judges of America no longer go by *any* Constitution. The legal profession has "evolved" since then, so it is now based on the Einsteinian Dogma "all truth is *relative*." There are no laws. The courts make them up as they go. Knowing what this has done to America since 1933, as a nation, would you be stupid enough to subscribe to evolution in *any* form for *any* purpose? Huxley (the chief promoter of Darwinism, et al.) stated that evolution produced the New Birth. Here are his words: "Evolution is a universal all pervading PROCESS...the world of reality is EVOLUTION—a single process of SELF-TRANSFORMATION" ("Evolution and Genetics," from *What is Science?* p. 272).

Self-transformation apart from God.

Self-transformation without any "new birth" or "new creature."

Self-transformation by rejecting the Truth.

Self-transformation without having to deal with the sin problem, and without dealing with the problem of personal accountability to God. That is the *heart* of every evolutionary theory taught by every evolutionist who ever lived.

V. We further resolve that any future discoveries about life on other planets or "unlocking the secrets of the universe" are to be interpreted in the light of Isaiah 14, 24, 40; Ezekiel 28; Job 26, and Psalms 140-149, all written more than 1400 years *before* the First Crusade.

VI. We anti-intellectuals resolve that any and all teachings of the Roman Catholic church—including all papal ex-cathedra statements on doctrine and practise—are to be deposited in the nearest dumpster if they do not line up with Hebrews 10, 1 Timothy 2, Psalm 69, Matthew 23, 1 John 5, Romans 8, Ephesians 2, John 17:9, and Acts 10-15.

VII. We further avow that a Biblical scholar who is not *actively engaged in trying to win men and women to Jesus Christ* is a TRAITOR to his calling and he is not following the greatest

scholar in the New Testament (1 Cor. 9:22), or the wisest man in the Old Testament (Prov. 11:30), or even the Lord Jesus Christ Himself (Matt. 4:19).

VIII. We further affirm that we will never be guilty of taking the world's greatest scholars seriously where they refuse to believe what Jesus Christ believed about *creation* (Mark 13), the *origins of man* (Matt. 19), the inspired scriptures that were *not* original autographs (John 5:39, Luke 4:21), about the way to Heaven (Matt. 11:27), or *eternal life* (John 3:36, 5:24).

IX. We anti-intellectuals resolve to stand fast by the bedrock truth that scholarly research and scholarly collations and scholarly conjectures and scholarly theses outside of John 5:39 are for one purpose and one purpose only to help tradesmen make a living (\$\$\$) in their trade by *magnifying the trade* (\$\$\$).

X. We resolve and affirm, further, that where any objective scientific theory or any objective philosophical precept is proved to be in line with Proverbs 23:13-14, 6:16-17, 14:34, and Genesis 1-12, we will accept it immediately and act on it. We will not fail to accept anything and *everything* in religion, science, art, music, philosophy, physics, genetics, politics, education, or "Biblical" scholarship *if it lines up with the BOOK*.

XI. We anti-intellectuals take Karl Marx, Albert Einstein, and Sigmund Freud to be worthless clowns who did not make one positive, scriptural contribution to the life of man on this planet, and we will say the same of Huxley, Darwin, Russell, Dewey, Menniger, Jung, Pavlov, the National Education Association, and the American Civil Liberties Union, with all of their attendant lawyers and professors.

XII. We anti-intellectuals believe that the most desultory (and pagan) sources of mis-information in the world are CBS, CNN, ABC, and NBC, and that three-fourths of the news reporting in any daily newspaper is nothing but propaganda put out by ignorant pagans.

XIII. Finally, we avow that "scientific progress," apart from *pain killers* and a few "miracle drugs" and a few *operations* (which are priced out of sight so that the mass of human-

ity will never be able to benefit from any of them), has accomplished absolutely NOTHING since Cain knocked Abel's brains out. We accept modern transportations and communications as a "necessary evil," and aside from their utility for preaching and teaching Biblical truth to the ends of the earth—and we are not talking about the scholarship of any Alexandrians in the Cult—we look at them as expensive ways to get somewhere or do something in a hurry. We stick to the basic principles of life as found in Genesis 1-12, holding that these truths are so "self-evident" that all of man's progress in six thousand years on seven continents has not been able to alter, or eliminate, one of them. These anti-intellectual truths, which no intellect has ever been able to annul or replace, alter or destroy, are these:

1. *Dirt farming and agriculture* are the roots of human life.
2. Hard work, *pain*, tears, and *sweat* are the common lot of human life.
3. Man is a dethroned king (*debased royalty*) who must die and return to the dirt from which he came.
4. Mankind is *alienated* from God, and man got that way by questioning what God SAID and then disobeying what God said.
5. Fallen man hides from God by feigning Agnosticism (see Gen. 4:9)
6. Children have no shame in their nakedness and prefer FRUIT to vegetables (see Gen. 2:16, 25 and comments in *The Bible Believer's Commentary on Genesis*).
7. A man will *rule* his home or he will *wreck* it.
8. *Negroes* are to serve Europeans and Asiatics.
9. *Asiatics* are to produce the Bible, the Messiah, and all of the world's "religions."
10. *Europeans* are to conquer the material ground of this earth and control the means of transportation and communication.
11. It will take a virgin born (Gen. 3:15) Saviour to undo the damage done in Genesis 3. This Saviour will come from a *Gentile* Hebrew named "Abram" (Gen. 12-13). He will be a *Jew* coming from Jacob.

12. There will be no restoration of nature or government till this Saviour takes over *both* of them. All attempts to restore Eden ("A lasting peace," "Bring in the kingdom," "For the furtherance of Thy kingdom," "His truth is marching on," "The Third Reich as Positive Christianity," "Blessed are the peacemakers," "Make me an instrument of peace," "Mary's peace-plan for Russia," "The Golden Age," "I had a dream," "The Great Society," "The New Deal," etc.) will result in terrorism, venereal disease, incarceration, famine, torture, bankruptcy, cannibalism, arrests, deportations, holocausts, and wars (see *The Sure Word of Prophecy*, 1959, 1970).
13. No one will come close to populating outer space before God slams down the curtain on the stage (Gen. 1:28, Psa. 115:16) in Revelation 19, Joel 2, Isaiah 2, Isaiah 9, Zechariah 14, and Matthew 24. The "inhabitants" of outer space are *there* and they will be *here* (Rev. 13), for they were *here* in Genesis 1-12: specifically, Genesis 6:1-10).

There it is. Now we have eliminated *every* college graduate who graduated from *every* school in America if that graduate was stupid enough to believe what they taught him in the classroom.

This is the MANIFESTO OF THE ANTI-INTELLECTUAL.

The Manifesto deals with the basic FACTS (not theories) of human life on seven continents from 4000 B.C. to 2000 B.C. Theories contrary (from the intellectuals) are just to funny for words for the proof has already been "in the pudding" and men have been eating this puddin' for six thousand years. There is no longer any doubt about the "fruit" of it. It has been one bellyache after another with heartburn after every "sittin'."

How much "intellectuality" and "scholarship" would any man on this planet need unless he was making a living in a trade that required tradesmen's terminology? I mean, say, any man on *any* continent, including Japanese Buddhists, Chinese Confucianists, Arabian Mohammadens, Indian Hindus, (male or

female, young or old) with or without all of their physical equipment, poor, middle class, rich or starving, say, *for any time in history from 4000 B. C. to the present*? What is the real truth about life on this planet; say, *any human life in any period of history in any type of civilized, or uncivilized, situation*? The truth is the CONTENTS OF ONE BOOK would equip any man (or woman) to:

1. Come to knowledge of the *Truth* (John 20:31, 14:6, 17:17).
2. Come to know the true God and obtain *eternal life* (1 John 5:20).
3. Obtain enough wisdom to handle any *situation* that came up (Col. 3:2, Phil. 4:13, 19).
4. Raise a *family* right if he (or she) had one (Proverbs, Ephesians, and Colossians).
5. Show him (or her) how to *make a living* and how to *deal* with his friends and his enemies, as well as his relatives, employer, and employees.
6. Give him (or her) instructions on what to do with his *life* and how to face *death*. Give him (or her) instructions on life before and after death, and on the future of the planet he lives on.
7. Show him (or her) how to *deal* with sickness, poverty, persecution, and bereavement, and how to respond to false teachers, con-men and educated liars.
8. Give him (or her) an *inner peace* and *joy* that men without the Book could not obtain, no matter how much education they had.
9. Get him (or her) around a thousand pitfalls that rich people and educated people fall into, and thereby help him (or her) avoid a "reaping" of sin and sorrow that others will have to reap.

Those things are found in one Book of less than fourteen hundred pages. I have just listed at least 666 authors who rejected that Book, and whose total page output certainly would have been nothing under 322,500 pages. For what was it needed? *Nothing*: nothing but to help some tradesmen (\$\$\$) make a living.

With the exception of a very small (and exceedingly small) handful of saved Bible scholars and teachers, modern "Biblical scholarship" is just as commercial and just as corrupt and just as deceptive as the scholarship of any Atheistic Evolutionist anywhere on the continent. The motive for writing such slop, and publishing it, is unworthy of a real Christian and so untrue to the callings of the New Testament that only a backslidden Christian with a seared conscience would allow himself to be recognized as a "Biblical" scholar when he was engaged in putting out such TRASH. This was the condition that A. T. Robertson, Spiros Zodhiates, Robert Sumner, Harold Willmington, Woodrow Kroll, Donald Waite, Bob Jones IV, Stewart Custer, Marshall Neal, Ronald Walker, James Price, Gary Hudson, Doug Kutilek, Benjamin Warfield, and others got into. There wasn't a "Biblical" scholar in the lot, and of the men I just listed, only ONE of them was a *real* "scholar" of ANY sorts.

How much intellectuality does a Christian need to find "all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge"? Well, *none*, really. He should learn how to read; that would help. If he can't read, cassette tapes would be a blessing. He should learn how to read his own language, not some dead language like Greek, which went out of circulation 1800 years ago. How *smart* does a Christian have to be to find Biblical truths and revelations denied to the men who wrote the *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, and similar works? Not much "smartness;" an IQ of 90 would do the job. I've talked with several farmers and hillbillies down South (who never finished High School) who had found deep truths in the scriptures that were completely hidden from the men who compiled *The Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, *The Companion Bible*, and the *Cross Reference Bible*. (Those publications, alone, would include more than fifty thousand corrections on the AV text by more than two hundred scholars through a period of eighteen hundred years).

After all, the essentials for a real Bible scholar—if his scholarship was truly "Biblical"—would not include any

linguistic ability at all, nor would it be concerned with manuscript evidence, or textual problems. The three basic essentials for scriptural "Biblical scholarship" would be:

1. A *believing heart*.
2. A *humble mind*.
3. *Time spent in the Book*.

Did you notice—if you read any of the 666 authors we mentioned in this writing—how those first two qualities are never mentioned by 666 scholars engaged in "scholarly" endeavors?

Did you notice that? I did. I was able to notice it as soon as I got saved (1949). When I got saved I began to THINK.

1. "The bigger the belfry, the more room for the bats" (Luke 10:21, Isa. 28:9, Isa. 29:14)
2. "Honey, if you ain't got no education, you jes gotta use yo brains" (James 1:5, Isa. 28:9).
3. "All the clowns are not in the circus."
4. "**Men of high degree are a lie**" (Psa. 62:9).

Signed: *Dr. Peter S. Ruckman, B.A., M.A., Ph.D., B.D., Th.M., D.D.*

There! If THAT can't make an anti-intellectual out of you, I don't know what can. I've had the treatment. I've been "exposed." It just didn't "take." Thank God.

"If any man among you seemeth to be wise in this world, let him become a fool, that he may be wise."

That order was given by a *Biblical Scholar*; it was written in *The Bible*.

I.Q. Test for Anti-Intellectuals

True or False:

1. Thurgood Marshall, Adam Clayton Powell, and Jesse Jackson are "Sambos."
2. Thurgood Marshall is an Octroon and Jesse Jackson is a *Mulatto*.
3. Lena Horne and Adam Powell are *Quadroons*.
4. Michael Luther King, Jr's real name was *Step 'n Fetchit*.
5. "Holy Mary, Mother of God" is a reference to *Rose Kennedy*.
6. The HEW and the HRS are branches of the ACLU and AT&T.
7. "CBS" means *Communist Bull Shooter*.
8. Coretta King only had *five* scriptural grounds for divorce.
9. Mrs. Ted Kennedy only had *thirty*.
10. The right side of a triangle is equal to one-half of the other two sides multiplied by one-fifth of the distance between the *apex* and the *index*.
11. Beethoven's Fifth is 90-proof Scotch.
12. To match Babe Ruth's home run record, Jackie Robinson had to pick up the bat five hundred more times.
13. Tyson's grandmother was King Kong's aunt.
14. A "1040 form" means ten inches around the waist and forty inches around the neck.
15. To figure the circumference of a circle the first step is to draw the circle.
16. Einstein's famous formula (XP3 over XPU equals BO times PDQ) proves that for every person born one dies.

17. Of the last forty-five wars since 1945 the UN has only started *five*.
18. Pope John Paul II dissects four grapefruits a week to keep half of one on his head at all times in public.
19. A Democratic Senator is just left of *Karl Marx*.
20. A Democratic Senator is just left of *Trotsky*.
21. A Democratic Senator is just right of *Ghenghis Khan*.
22. It takes two smart Polacks to outsmart a *dumb* Mexican
23. It takes \$5.00 to buy a piece of paper worth 17 cents
24. No business man has to worry about bankruptcy if he is only \$3,000,000,000 in debt.
25. The moon landing proves there are *rocks* on the moon.
26. Modern computerized electronic warfare reveals that for every person born one dies.
27. One man and one woman and one child is a "family"
28. Two queers with someone else's child is a "family."
29. Two faggots and two double-breasted finks equal a *zoo*.
30. You will die of old age if you don't get killed or get sick.
31. Carbohydrates, fats, acids, roughage, cholestrol, vitamins, and minerals will kill you eventually if you eat enough of them.
32. *Madonna* was afraid to sing in public in a poncho.
33. Using America's best example for a teenage role model—Elvis Presley—one learns that five prescription drugs will get you to the top of the ladder
34. *Oliver North* is running for president in 1992 with *Senator Metzenbaum* as a running mate.

Science and Astronomy:

1. I have 5,000 quarks, 5,000 mesons, 3,000 quirks, 8,000 quacks, and one kook. Do I have enough material to construct an ATOM?
2. I have 3,000 black holes, 5,000 star clusters, 8,000 galaxies, and 12,000 "red giants." Do I have enough material to play "*Dungeons and Dragons*"?
3. Shouldn't a monument be erected at Space Center for

the early pioneers of space flight (*Buck Rogers, Flash Gordon, and Count Zeppelin*)?

4. If you were traveling at the speed of light and a light traveling faster than the speed of light suddenly turned on could you see your reflection in a mirror behind your back?

5. If you were driving north in a car at 450 miles an hour and an Amtrack going 20 miles per hour passed you going south, and there was a treadmill inside the Amtrack where a bicyclist was doing 300 miles per hour pedaling west to east, how fast would he really be going if your speedometer was 100 miles per hour off?

6. If it is 20,000 million light years to the nearest star, how old would your great grandchildren be if you could fly at the speed of 400,000,000 miles per second and they got half way there?

7. If you air-conditioned Venus and Mars, could you live on *Jupiter* if it didn't have all-electric houses?

8. If you traveled at the speed of light around the equator east to west for 5,000 years, how old would you be if you had started at ten years old? A. 30 years old. B. 20 years old. C. Minus 30 years old. D. Minus 200 years old. E. Would you wind up being young enough (say minus 300 years) to have been your own great-great-grandfather?

9. If you dropped a feather and a ton of lead out of a B-52 at 30,000 feet, why would they both hit the ground simultaneously? Do you really *believe* this?

10. In the Egyptian hieroglyphics, the word for "jackass" is the same word in the Babylonian cuneiform for "journalist." Explain this coincidence.

11. In Ugaritic the words for "apostate hypocrite" are the same as those in Senegalese for "Christian scholar." Is this accidental?

12. If "pie are round" instead of square, how can you *square* pi when working on a circle?

13. Is there a black Santa Claus on the South Pole? *Prove this.*

14. What color is a BLACK hole inside? Can you prove this?

15. If I can photograph the trademark on a golf ball lying on a green when I am using a camera 500,000 feet in the air, can I fix a dead nerve in a man's back?

16. Has science found a way to turn salt water into fresh water? If so, why was not \$500,000,000 spent on developing this project instead of viewing *Star Wars*, *Jaws*, and *Rocky I and II*?

17. If you are a "Global Citizen," is your god a globe or citizens? Can your own god murder you? Can your god burn out or burn up? Was Jesus Christ a "global citizen" who observed Earth Day? (Answer each question with a yes, no, or maybe.)

18. What do you think of this exam? (Don't be too explicit!)

19. Is *Mad* magazine more scientific than the *National Geographic* magazine? How would you prove this?

20. If science is a body of proven fact that can be *demonstrated*, what is evolution doing in the college curriculum; any college curriculum? Explain.

Multiple Choice:

1. Michael Jackson is Andrew Jackson's: A. Cousin. B. Great grandson. C. Clone. D. Adopted great grandson. E. None of the above.

2. Michael Jackson is: A. White. B. Black. C. Gray. E. Indigo. F. Male. G. Female. H. Neuter. I. A mystery program. (Choose five)

3. Madonna is: A. A picture by Raphael. B. A statue by Michaelangelo. C. A restaurant in the French Quarter. D. A millionaire who modeled lingerie. E. A female demon at Lourdes.

4. If 5 men in a room of 15 men have brown hats, and 3 don't have green or blue hats, and 2 have blue hats, and 6 don't have orange hats, how many men in the room don't have brown hats? A. 45. B. 3. C. $\frac{1}{2}$. D. $4\frac{1}{2}$. E. None of them.

5. If you are going north at 55 mph and a car passes you going 40 mph, will you get to your destination before he gets to his? A. Yes. B. No. C. You will arrive simultaneously.

6. If you had to vote for the following for president, who

would you vote for: A. Tiny Tim. B. James Cagney. C. Rock Hudson. C. Ted Kennedy. D. Gomer Pyle. E. Johnny Carson. F. Dukakis. G. Charles Manson. H. Tip O'Neal.

7. The next war will be in: A. Persia. B. Iran. C. Syria. D. Detroit. E. Lebanon. F. India. G. Miami. H. Washington, D.C. I. Saudi Arabia. (Choose two)

8. When man unlocks the secrets of the universe he will discover: A. There is no free lunch. B. You reap what you sow. C. Jimmy Hoffa was hiding behind Tammy Bakker's make-up. D. A cure for the common cold. E. Einstein had a sponge for a brain.

9. Brinkley and Huntley were more dedicated Communists than: A. Alger Hiss. B. Walter Cronkite. C. Barbara Walters. D. Phil Donahue. E. Karl Marx. F. Edward R. Murrow. G. Mao Tse-tung. (Choose three)

10. World War I settled the question of: A. Stamp collectors. B. The boundary between British Columbia and Saskatchewan. C. Colonel House's piggy bank. D. Who would get to run Bismark, North Dakota. (Choose two)

11. World War II settled the problems of: A. Hoe handle production in Nebraska. B. The survival of the White Owl in Seattle. C. Veterans benefits after a nuclear war. D. Hermann Goering's room and board. (Choose two)

12. "Watergate" is a reference to: A. A plumbing company. B. A Roman Catholic hotel. C. A gate in the walls of Jerusalem. D. A welfare program for alligators. E. A door in the Bermuda Triangle.

13. The 65,000 Americans killed in Vietnam proved that: A. Grass is better than pot. B. LSD and the SDS are the same Rock group. C. Lt. Calley killed twenty students at Kent State. D. John Kennedy had the wrong religion. E. A war to end wars was still future. F. The popes were psychotic.

14. Haight Asbury and Woodstock were high points in: A. Moral purity. B. A revival of Christianity. C. The making of a great nation. D. Higher education standards. E. Garbage disposal.

15. San Francisco is famous for being the site of the. A. Original United Nations. B. 300,000 Fruits. C. A Democratic

Convention D. An earthquake. (Choose two)

16. How many Mafia members are working in the *Vatican*?
A. 20. B. 30. C. 4. D. 300. E. None.

Outstanding Personalities:

1. Name three *dopeheaded fornicators* besides Elvis Presley, John Lennon, and John Belushi.

2. Name three *fornicating sluts* besides Madonna, Donna Rice, and Christine Keeler.

3. Name three *Communists* besides FDR, Dan Rather, and Ted Turner.

4. Name three *bloody killers* besides Mandela, Pope John Paul II, and the Son of Sam.

5. Name three *cult leaders* besides Charles Manson, Pope Paul VI, and Jim Jones.

6. Name three *faggots* besides Rock Hudson, Liberace, Bill Tilden, and Peter Tschaiikovsky.

7. Name three *atheists* besides Gromyko, Kruschev, Gorbachev, and Ted Turner.

8. Was *John DeLorean* a hockey player, a drug dealer, or a song writer?

9. *Truman Capote* was a bankrupt German, Harry Truman's Capo, or a dopeheaded writer?

10. *Andy Warhol* was part of the team of Amos and Andy, Andy Hardy's brother, a manufacturer of soup cans, or a drunken bum?

11. *John Wayne* was a Mexican spy in the battle of the Alamo, an LCT on Guadalcanal, Marion Morrison in disguise, or a husband of three Mexican women?

12. *Idi Amin* was a butcher, the head of the Black KKK, the head of the NAACP, or "the father of his country"?

13. Name three *inflated egotists* besides Cassius Clay, John Paul II, Cardinal Sin, and Bertrand Russell.

14. Were *Jerry Rubin* and *Abbie Hoffman* a comedy team, anchormen on a news broadcast, winners of the Wimbledon Doubles' tournament, or two dopeheaded fornicators?

15. Is the reason why no one can examine Michael Luther

King, Jr's record because: A. He couldn't write legibly unless plagiarizing someone else. B. It revealed that he was a Conservative Republican. C. It contained plans for bombing the UN building. D. It gives details on how to build flying saucers. (Choose two)

16. What happened at the *Bay of Pigs*? A. Did John Kennedy get food poisoning? B. Did the Polish girls all drown? C. Did hounds get upset when they heard pigs baying? D. 2,000 pigs ran down a steep place and were drowned?

17. *Bernhard Goetz* was the only man in history: A. To get arrested for defending himself. B. To be tried five times for the same offence. C. To serve six months in prison for being prepared to defend his life. D. Who knew what thugs used sharpened screwdrivers for. (Choose two)

18. Name three *chronic alcoholics* besides Frank Sinatra, Dean Martin, Ernest Hemmingway, Jack London, Stephen Foster, and Grace Ranier's husband.

19. Name three *half-crazy morons* besides John Dewey, William James, William Glasser, Giovanni Gentile, and Timothy O'Leary.

20. *John Maynard Keynes* taught: A. Money grows on trees. B. England how to go bankrupt. C. Germany how to go bankrupt. D. America how to go bankrupt. E. In the long run we are all dead. (Choose two)

21. What did Henry Wallace, Mohatma Gandhi, H. G. Wells, Alger Hiss, and Marilyn Monroe all have in common? A. They were sinners. B. They all got good press. C. They all dropped dead. D. They all thought they knew what they were doing. E. None of them knew what they were doing. (Choose three)

Logic:

1. If progress is automatic and continual, how many "break throughs" and "revolutions" are necessary every other year?

2. If the black race has been here longer than any other race, aren't they more intellectually developed than the other races? Explain.

3. Will population of outer space produce interstellar pollution or interplanetary war, or both?

4. If A is equal to B, and C is equal to D, and D is equal to A, what is the difference between L, M, N, O, and P? (Demonstrate, please)

5. What name is out of place: 1. Son of Sam 2. Charles Manson 3. Idi Amin 4. Al Capone 5. Pope Pius XII 6. Betty Grable.

6. What name is out of place: 1. Joseph Smith 2. Pope Paul VI 3. Judge Rutherford 4. Pope John XXIII 5. Mary Baker Eddy. 6. James Zebedee 7. Pope John Paul II.

7. What name is out of place: 1. Jimmy Hendrix 2. General William Booth 3. Tina Turner 4. Janice Joplin 5. The Rolling Stones 6. Elvis Presley.

8. If I have two pennies, five nickels, three quarters, one dime, and six half dollars, do I have 40 cents in real money?

9. If I have ten \$20 bills, four \$10 bills, and thirty \$5 bills, do I have 15 cents worth of paper or 15½ cents worth of paper?

10. If you thought you could *not* have done what you *thought* you did when you *didn't* do it, would you think that what you are *doing* could be what you *would have done* if you had not thought that you *couldn't* do it?

11. If what happened was what was *going to happen*, and if what will happen could *not* have happened, what will happen if what could happen *didn't* happen?

12. If A is equal to B, and B is equal to C right on to Z, what is the alphabet for?

13. If RNA is equal to DNA and an amino acid is equal to an enzyme and sugars are equal to ammonia, doesn't this prove that everything that showed up by accident is equal? Explain.

14 Explain the difference between the following terms: whoremonger, womanizer, fornicator, swinger, liberated lifestyle, whorehopper, daisy chainer, adulterer, hustler, movie star, rock star, and the New Morality

15. Explain the difference between: dopehead, drug abuser, pothead, hopehead, drug user, speed freak, drug problem, cubehead, Fried Freddy.

16. If black and white are equal and identical, explain how the following are equal and identical: Jim Jones and John Wesley; Adolph Hitler and Mother Teresa; submarines and stealth bombers, ham sandwiches and nachos; rock music and Bach; Bloody Mary and Abraham Lincoln, General Douglas McArthur and Cassius Clay; Sergeant York and Abbie Hoffman; Wayne Gretsky and Andy Warhol.

17. Does "Earth Day" mean you worship *dirt*, those who *came out of the dirt*, or those who *went back to the dirt*?

18. If the Balkan wars produced WWI, and WWI produced WWII, and WWII produced Korea and Vietnam, how many wars will it take to produce WWII? Explain.

19. Explain "PEACE ON EARTH" in relation to the Persian Gulf, the Palestinian Question, the IRA in Ulster, Moscow, Peking, downtown Detroit, and downtown Washington, D.C.

20. If "the fundamentals" are the only necessary things to be found in the Bible translation, why aren't books on *Systematic Theology* called "Bibles"?

Grading Your Paper:

Since all is relative and there are no absolutes (Einstein) *there are no specific answers to any question* one answer is as good as another. Only where you failed to follow instructions can there be an error. For example, if you failed to *explain* a question saying "explain" you missed half the question. If you made two choices instead of three, or one instead of two (multiple choice) you missed one third of the question.

Your total score, if all questions were answered, would be 850 (85 times 10), if there were 85 questions. I *think* there are 85 but it might have been 84, or 86, or even 82. This doesn't really matter because in social promotions 82 is as good as 92, or 66 is as good as 86, and so forth.

Take the number 850 (or 860, or 840, or whatever) and subtract from it 33.33 for each multiple choice you missed—any choice was correct but you had to have the right number of choices—and 50.5 from each question not explained. This final score will indicate your I.Q.

If your score is above 850 (or 840, or 845) you are as batty as a bed bug.

If your score is between 840 and 740 you have one oar in the water.

If your score is between 640 and 740 your pilot light is blown out.

If your score is between 540 and 640 you are not playing the game with a full deck.

If your score is below 540 you are NORMAL, at least down to 340. Below 340 you are a GENIUS.

Termann's Classification gives:

840-860 *KOOKY*

740-840 *KINKY*

640-740 *SPOOKY*

540-640 *STINKY*

Below 540: *FLUKEY*

Genius: *FLUNKY*

The important thing is not how crazy you *are*, but how crazy you *think* everyone else is who thinks that *you're* crazy. Learn to look at things from another one's point of view, and remember that since all men are equal and are brothers, the differences between stinkeys and pinkies, flukeys and spookies, flunkies and monkeys is not really a difference at all. Only prejudiced people look at things that way. Don't be PREJUDICED. That shows a lack of high I.Q. *Only low I.Q. people are prejudiced.*

May Earth bless you, and have a happy Globe!

ERRATUM

page 2—Schwartznegger should be Schwarzenegger.

The greatest "strong man" in Hollywood, in the 1980s, has a peculiar name: "Schwarzenegger." If you divide the name at the "e" you get "Schwarze negger or Schwarze neger" (which means "Black Nigger"). If you divide it at the "n" you get: "Schwarzen egger" which means an "area with black soil."

"Negger" is as "Niger" or "Nigeria." This is the word from which you get "NIGGER."

If you add one "G" to the name of a real river (the Niger), **YOU CAN CLAIM A DETECTIVE IS "OUT TO GET BLACKS" IF HE USED THE WORD TEN YEARS PRIOR TO A BLACK MURDERING TWO PEOPLE.**





Dr. Ruckman holds six earned degrees, earning his Ph.D. at Bob Jones University. His chalk-talk sermons, *Drawing Men to Christ*, are carried on over forty-three stations in twenty-one states and the *Theological Seminar of the Air* radio series has been broadcast over twenty years. Currently, his schedule includes pastoring, Bible conferences, youth camps, revivals, weekly TV and radio programs, and teaching over twelve Bible courses, including classes on the graduate level. Dr. Ruckman has written over one hundred books, ten being major commentaries, and a church history of two volumes.